

THE MERCERSBURG REVIEW.

APRIL, 1860.

ART. I.—CONSTANTINE THE GREAT.

The name of Constantine the Great is identified with one of the most important epochs in the history of Christianity, when it ceased to be an oppressed and persecuted sect, and became the established religion of the Roman empire. A grateful posterity has given him the surname of the Great, and he may be said to be fully entitled to it, not, indeed, by his moral character which is far from approaching the ideal of a truly Christian ruler, but by his military and political ability, his far sighted statesmanship, and especially his liberal protection of the Church which he raised from a state of depression to well deserved honor and power.

Constantine, the first Christian Cæsar, the founder of Constantinople and the Byzantine empire and one of the most gifted, energetic, and successful of the Roman emperors, was the first representative of the imposing idea of a Christian theocracy, which assumes all subjects to be Christians, connects civil and religious rights and regards Church and State the two arms of one and the same divine government on earth. This idea was more fully developed by his successors, it animated the whole middle age, and is yet working under various forms in these latest times; though it has never been fully realized, whether in the Byzantine, the German, or the Russian empire, the Roman Church-State, the Calvinistic republic of Geneva, or the early Puritanic colonies of New England. At the same time, however, Constantine stands also as the type of

an indiscriminating and harmful conjunction of Christianity with politics, of the holy symbol of peace with the honors of war, of the spiritual interests of the kingdom of heaven with the earthly interests of a despotic monarchy.

In judging of this remarkable man and his reign, we must by all means keep to the great historical principle, that all representative characters act consciously or unconsciously as the free and responsible organs of the spirit of their age which moulds them first before they can mould it in turn, and that the spirit of the age itself whether good or bad or mixed, is but an instrument in the hands of divine Providence which rules and overrules all the actions and motives of men. Through a history of three centuries Christianity had already inwardly overcome the world, and thus had made such an outward revolution as has attached itself to the name of this prince both possible and unavoidable. It were extremely superficial, to refer so thorough and momentous a change to the personal motives of an individual, be they motives of policy, of piety, or of superstition. But unquestionably every age produces and shapes its own organs, as its own purposes require. So in the case of Constantine. He was distinguished by that genuine political wisdom, which, putting itself at the head of the age, clearly saw, that heathenism had outlived itself in the Roman empire, and that Christianity alone could breathe new vigor into it and furnish its moral support. Especially on the point of the external catholic unity his monarchical politics accorded with the hierarchical episcopacy of the Church. Hence from the year 313 he placed himself in close connection with the bishops, made peace and harmony his first object in the Donatist and Arian controversies, applied the predicate "catholic" to the Church in all official documents, and as his predecessors were supreme pontiffs of the heathen religions of the empire, so he desired to be looked upon as a sort of bishop, as universal bishop of the external affairs of the Church.*

* *Ἐπίσκοπος τῶν ἐκτὸς (πραγμάτων) τῆς ἐκκλησίας*; in distinction from the proper bishops the *ἐπίσκοποι τῶν εἰσὶν τῆς ἐκκλησίας*. Vid. Eus. Vit. Const. IV, 24.

All this by no means from mere self-interest, but for the good of the empire, which, now shaken to its foundations and threatened by barbarians on every side, could only by some new bond of unity be consolidated and upheld until at last the seeds of Christianity and civilization should be planted among the barbarians themselves, the representatives of the future. His personal policy thus coincided with the interests of the State.

But with the political he united also a religious motive, not clear and deep indeed, yet honest, and strongly infused with the superstitious disposition to judge of a religion by its outward success and to ascribe a magical virtue to signs and ceremonies. He adopted Christianity first as a superstition, and put it by the side of his heathen superstition, till finally the Christian vanquished the pagan, though without itself developing into a pure and enlightened faith. §

At first Constantine, like his father, in the spirit of the Neo-Platonic syncretism of dying heathendom, revered all the gods as mysterious powers; especially Apollo, the god of the sun, to whom in the year 308 he presented munificent gifts. Nay, so late as the year 321 he enjoined regular consultation of the soothsayers* in public misfortunes, according to ancient heathen usage; even later, he placed his new residence, Byzantium, under the protection of the God of the Martyrs and the heathen goddess of Fortune; † and down to the end of his life he retained the title and the dignity of a Pontifex Maximus, or high-priest of the heathen hierarchy. ‡ Of course these inconsistencies

§ Mosheim, in his work on the first three centuries p. 965 sqq. (Murdoch's transl. II. 460 sqq.) labors to prove at length that Constantine was no hypocrite, but sincerely believed, during the greater part of his life, that the Christian religion was the only true religion.

* The *Auruspices* or interpreters of sacrifices who foretold future events from the entrails of victims.

† According to Eusebius (Vit. Const. I. III, c. 48) he dedicated Constantinople to "the God of the martyrs," but according to Zosimus (Hist. II, c. 31), to two goddesses. Subsequently the city stood under the special protection of the Virgin Mary.

‡ His successors also did the same, down to Gratian, 375, who renounced the title then become quiet empty.

may be referred also to policy and accomodation to the toleration edict of 313. But with his every victory over his pagan rivals, Galerius, Maxentius, and Licinius, his personal leaning to Christianity and his confidence in the magic power of the sign of the cross increased; though he did not formally renounce heathenism, and did not receive baptism until, in 337, he was laid upon the bed of death.

He had an imposing and winning person. His moral character was not without noble traits, among which temperance, a chastity rare for the time, and a liberality and beneficence bordering on wastefulness were prominent. Many of his laws and regulations breathe the spirit of Christian justice and humanity, promoted the elevation of the female sex, improved the condition of slaves and of unfortunates and gave free play to the efficiency of the Church throughout the whole empire. Altogether he was one of the best, the most fortunate, and the most influential of the Roman emperors. Yet he had great faults. He was far from being so pure and so venerable as Eusebius, blinded by his favor to the Church, depicts him. It must, with all regret, be conceded, that his progress in the knowledge of Christianity was not a progress in the practice of its virtues. His love of display and his prodigality, his suspiciousness and his despotism, increased with his power. The very brightest period of his reign is stained with gross crimes, which even the spirit of the age and the policy of an absolute monarch cannot excuse. After having reached, upon the bloody path of war, the goal of his ambition, the sole possession of the empire, yea, in the very year in which he summoned the great council of Nice he ordered the execution of his conquered rival and brother-in-law, Licinius, in breach of a solemn promise of mercy.* Still later, in 326, he caused the death of his eldest son Crispus, who had incurred suspicion of conspiracy and of adulterous and incestuous purposes towards his step-mother, Fausta, but is

* Eusebius justifies this procedure towards an enemy of the Christians by the laws of war. But what becomes of the breach of a solemn pledge? The murder of Crispus, he passes over in prudent silence in violation of the highest duty of the historian to relate the truth and the whole truth.

generally regarded as innocent. Later authors assert, though gratuitously, that the emperor, like David, bitterly repented of this sin. He has been frequently charged besides, though it would seem altogether unjustly, with the death of his second wife Fausta (326 ?), who, after twenty years of happy wedlock, is said to have been convicted of slandering her step-son, Crispus, and of adultery with a slave, and then to have been suffocated in the vapor of an over-heated bath.†

At all events Christianity did not produce in Constantine a thorough moral transformation. He was concerned more to advance the outward, social position of the Christian religion, than to further its inward mission. Not a decided, pure, and consistent character, he stands on the line of transition between two ages and two religions; and his life bears plain marks of both.‡

† This is doubted even by Gibbon, who bears generally no special favor to Constantine; and still more decidedly by Niebuhr (*Vorträge über röm. Gesch.*, v. Isler, Berl. 1848, III, 302), who is also inclined to think, that Crispus deserved death. As to the alleged murder of Fausta, the accounts are rather late and discordant; Zosimus, certainly in heathen prejudice and slanderous extravagance, ascribing to Constantine the death of two women, the innocent Fausta, and an adulteress, the supposed mother of his three successors; Philostorgius, on the contrary, declaring Fausta guilty (*H. E.* II, 4; only fragmentary). Then again older witnesses indirectly contradict this view; two orations, namely, of the next following reign, which imply, that Fausta survived the death of her son, the younger Constantine, who outlived his father by three years. *Comp. Julian. Orat. I.* and *Monod in Const. Jun. c. 4.* ad *Calocem Eutrop.*, cited by Gibbon, c. XVIII, notes 25 and 26. *Eusebius* denies both the murder of Crispus and of Fausta, though only on account of the silence of Eusebius which proves no more than the inexcusable partiality of this distinguished historian for his imperial friend.

‡ The heathen historians extol the earlier part of his reign, and depreciate the later. Thus Eutropius, X, 6: *In primo imperii tempore optimis principibus, ultimo mediis comparandus.* With this judgment Gibbon agrees (c. XVIII), presenting in Constantine an inverted Augustus: "In the life of Augustus we behold the tyrant of the republic, converted, almost by imperceptible degrees, into the father of his country and of human kind. In that of Constantine, we may contemplate a hero, who had so long inspired his subjects with love, and his enemies with terror, degenerating into a cruel and dissolute monarch, corrupted by his fortune, or raised by conquest above the necessity of dissimulation." But this theory of progressive degeneracy, adopted also by F. C. Schlosser in his *Weltgeschichte*, while ecclesiastical historians, e. g., Mosheim, generally hold the opposite view of a progressive improvement, is hardly tenable. For, on the one hand, the earlier life of Constantine has such features of cruelty as the surrender of the conquered barbarian kings to the wild beasts in the amphitheatre at Trier in 310 or 311, for which he was lauded by a heathen orator, the ungenerous conduct

From these general remarks we turn to the leading features of his life and reign, so far as they bear upon the history of the Church.

Constantine, son of the co-emperor Constantius Chlorus, who reigned over Gaul, Spain, and Britain till his death in 306, was born probably at Naissus in Dacia, in the year 272. His mother was Helena, daughter of an inn-keeper, the first wife of Constantius, afterwards divorced. Constantine distinguished himself in the service of Diocletian in the Egyptian and Persian wars; went afterwards to Gaul and Britain, and at York was proclaimed Emperor by his dying father and by the Roman troops. His father before him held a favorable opinion of the Christians as peaceable and honorable citizens, and protected them in the West, during the Diocletian persecution in the East. This respectful tolerant regard descended to Constantine, and the good effect of it, compared with the evil results of the opposite course of his antagonist Galerius, could but encourage him to pursue it. He reasoned, as Eusebius reports from his own mouth, in the following manner: My father revered the Christian God and uniformly prospered, while the emperors who worshipped the heathen gods died a miserable death; therefore, that I may enjoy a happy life and reign, I will imitate the example of my father and join myself to the cause of the Christians, who are growing daily, while the heathen are diminishing. This low utilitarian consideration weighed heavily in the mind of an ambitious captain who looked forward to the highest seat of power within the gift of his age. Whether his mother, whom he always revered, and who made a pilgrimage to Jerusalem in her eightieth year, planted the germ of the Christian faith in her son, as Theodoret supposes, or herself became a Christian through his influence, as Eusebius asserts, must remain undecided. According to the heathen Zosimus, whose statement is unquestionably false and

toward Heronius his father-in-law, the murder of the infant son of Maxentius, and the triumphal exhibition of the head of Maxentius on his entrance into Rome in 312. On the other hand his most humane laws, such as the abolition of the gladiatorial shows, date from his later reign.

malicious, an Egyptian, who came out of Spain (probably the bishop Hosius of Cordova, a native of Egypt, is intended), persuaded him, after the murder of Crispus, (which did not occur before 326), that by converting to Christianity he might obtain forgiveness of his sins.

The first public evidence of a positive leaning towards the Christian religion, he gave in his contest with the pagan Maxentius, who had usurped the government of Italy and Africa, and is universally represented as a cruel, dissolute tyrant, hated by heathens and Christians alike.* Called by the Roman people to their aid, Constantine marched from Gaul across the Alps with an army of ninety-eight thousand soldiers of every nationality, and defeated Maxentius in three battles; the last in October, 312, at the Milvian bridge near Rome, where Maxentius found a disgraceful death in the waters of the Tiber.

Before this victory belongs the familiar story of the miraculous cross, which marks for us on the one hand the victory of Christianity, and on the other the ominous admixture of foreign political and military interests with it. The occurrence, however, is variously described. Lactantius, the earliest witness, some three years after the battle, speaks only of a dream by night, in which the emperor was directed (it is not stated by whom, whether by Christ, or by an angel) to stamp on the shields of his soldiers "the heavenly sign of God," that is. the cross with the name of Christ, and thus to go forth against his enemy.† Eusebius, on the contrary, gives the more minute account, and gives it on the authority of a subsequent statement of Constantine himself under oath—not, however, till the year 338,

* Even Zosimus gives the most unfavorable account of him.

† De mort. persec. c. 44. p. 278 sq. : "Commonitus est in quiete Constantinus, ut coeleste signum Dei notaret in scutis, atque ita proelium committeret. Fecit ut jussus est, et transversa X litera, summo capite circumflexo (the *labarum*, as it was called under the successors of Constantine) Christum in sentis notat. Quo signo armatus exercitus cepit ferrum." This work is indeed by many denied to Lactantius, but was at all events composed soon after the event, perhaps about 315, while Constantine was as yet on good terms with Licinius, to whom the author, c. 46, ascribes a similar vision of an angel, who is said to have taught him a form of prayer on his expedition against the heathen tyrant Maximin.

a year after the death of the Emperor, his only witness, and twenty-six years after the event†—that to him (and to his army also)§ on his march from Gaul to Italy (the spot is not specified), in clear noon-day, while at prayer, therefore awake, there appeared a shining cross in the heavens with the inscription : “By this conquer,”|| and in the following night Christ himself, directing him to have a standard prepared in the form of this sign of the cross, and with that to proceed against Maxentius and all other enemies. According to Rufinus,¶ a later writer, the sign of the cross appeared to Constantine in a dream (which agrees with the account of Lactantius), and upon his awaking in terror, an angel exclaimed to him : “Hoc vince.”

The skeptical question might here arise : What has the sacred symbol of redemption to do with the bloody standard of war, the gentle Prince of peace with the god of battle? But there was nothing in this unnatural union offensive to the religious character of Constantine and his age. The miraculous element of the phenomenon agrees likewise very well with the prevailing idea of antiquity respecting the supernatural origin of dreams and visions. The pagan Julian was much more superstitious in this matter, than his Christian uncle, and on his expedition to the Persians he was supposed by Libanius to have been accompanied by a host of gods, which, however, in the view of Gregory of Nazianzen was rather an army of demons. Besides, to deny the whole event and to resolve it either into a mere military stratagem, or a pious fraud,* would compel us either to impute to the emperor, at a ven-

† In his *Vita Constant.* (composed about 338) I, 27–30. But in his *Church History* (written after 324), though he has good occasion (I. IX, c. 8, 9), Eusebius says nothing of the occurrence, whether through oversight or ignorance, or of purpose, it is hard to decide. In any case the silence casts suspicion on the details of his subsequent story.

§ This is certainly a mistake. For if a whole army consisting of more than ninety thousand soldiers of every nation had seen the vision of the cross, Eusebius might have cited many witnesses, and Constantine might have dispensed with a solemn oath.

|| Τὸ ἐν (τῷ σταυρῷ) νῖκα ; Hac (or Hoc, sc. signo) vince, or vinctus.

¶ Hist. eccl. IX, 9.

* As Hornbeck, Thomacius, Arnold, Gibbon(?) and Manso did.

erable age, willful falsehood and solemn perjury, or to refuse all credibility to the celebrated Church historian and bishop of Caesarea. Somewhat of fact must, therefore, no doubt be supposed. The more so as the testimony of Lactantius is independent both of Constantine and Eusebius. But then we have still the choice between a proper miracle, † a natural phenomenon or optical illusion, ‡ and a nocturnal dream or psychological illusion. † A divine miracle of the kind described by Eusebius is hardly worthy of the character of Christ who, if he had actually appeared to Constantine either personally (according to Eusebius), or through an angel (as Rufinus has it), would have revealed to him the saving truth and directed him to repent and be baptized rather than to construct a military banner for a bloody battle. In no case can we ascribe to this experience, as Eusebius does, the character of a sudden and thorough conversion, as to Paul's vision on the way to Damascus. For, on the one hand, Constantine was never hostile to Christianity, but most probably favorable to it from early youth; and on the other, he put off full conversion and baptism quite five and twenty years, almost to the very hour of death. A natural phenomenon in the skies, a solar halo around the sun, or a peculiar formation of the clouds, such as would answer the case in hand, has no parallel in the annals of astronomy and would not explain at all the inscription: "*Hoc vince.*" The facts in the case will, therefore, probably resolve themselves into this: that before the battle he prayed earnestly to the God of the Christians for assistance, while Maxentius, as Zosimus also testifies, * sacrificed to the heathen gods, and placed his

† This is the view generally entertained by the older and the Roman Catholic historians.

‡ So Fabricius, Schroeckh (vol. V. p. 83) Gieseler (I ¶ 56 note 29 where he refers us to similar cross-like clouds in 1517 and 1552, which were mistaken by the cötemporary Lutherans for supernatural signs), and even Neander.

† Mosheim (although after a lengthy discussion in his large work he comes to no definite conclusion), and more recent writers, also Neander, who thinks that the natural phenomenon in the skies was perhaps followed by a dream.

* Histor. II, 16.

superstitious trust in them ; and that Constantine, already familiar with the general use of the sign of the cross among the Christians and with their faith in its protecting power, on this occasion first used, with superstitious trust, the Labarum,† afterwards so called : that is the sacred standard of the Christian cross with the Greek monogram of the name of Christ.‡ Probably this was suggested, not by a visible figure in the heavens (which rests merely on the testimony of Eusebius and may be a subsequent exaggeration or mistake), but as all other authorities suggest, by a dream or inward vision which took in Constantine's view, especially after his happy success, the character of a supernatural revelation. To this cross-standard he attributed his victory over his heathen enemies.

After his triumphant entrance into Rome, he had his statue erected upon the forum with the Labarum in his right hand, and the inscription beneath : "By this saving sign, the true token of bravery, I have delivered your city from the yoke of the tyrant."§ Three years afterwards the senate erected to him a triumphal arch of marble, which, to this day, within sight of the sublime views of

† *Λάβραρον*, also *λάβραρον* ; derived not from *labor*, nor from *λάβραρον*, nor from *λαβείν*, but probably from a barbarian root, otherwise unknown, and introduced into the Roman terminology, even before Constantine, by the Celtic or Germanic recruits. Comp. Du Cange, Glossar., and Suicer, Thesaur., s. h. v.

‡ XP, the first two letters of the name of Christ, so written upon one another as to make the form of the cross, of which Münter (*Sinnbilder der alten Christen*, p. 36 sqq.) has collected from ancient coins, vessels, and tombstones more than twenty different forms. The monogram, as well as the sign of the cross, was in use among the Christians long before Constantine, probably as early as the Antonines and Hadrian. Yes, the standards and trophies of victory generally had the appearance of a cross, as Minucius Felix, Tertullian, Justin and other apologists of the second century told the heathens. According to Killen (*Ancient Church*, p. 317, note) who quotes Aringhus, *Roma subterranea II* p. 567, as his authority, the famous monogram (of course in a different sense) is found already before Christ on coins of the Ptolemies. The only thing new, therefore, is the union of this symbol in its Christian sense and application with the Roman military standard, which was richly adorned, besides, with the crown and the likeness of the emperor, and with gold and precious stones.

§ Eus. H. E. IX, 9 : Τούτω τῷ σωτηριακῷ (salutari, not singulari, as Rufinus has it) σημείῳ, τῷ ἀληθινῷ ἐν ἡμῶν τῇ ἀρχῇ, τὴν πόλιν ἐκ τῶν ἀπὸ ζοροῦ τοῦ τυράννου διασωθέντων ἀντιθέμενος, κ. τ. λ. Gibbon, however, thinks it more probable, that at last the labarum and the inscription date only from the second or third visit of Constantine to Rome.

the pagan Colosseum, indicates at once the decay of ancient art, and the downfall of heathenism; as the neighboring arch of Titus commemorates the downfall of Judaism and the destruction of the temple. The inscription on this arch of Constantine, however, ascribes his victory over the hated tyrant, not only to his master mind, but indefinitely also to the impulse of Deity (*instinctu Divinitatis*); by which a Christian would naturally understand the true God, while a heathen, like the orator Nazarius, in a eulogy pronounced on Constantine in the year 321, might take it for the celestial guardian power of the "*urbs aeterna*."

At all events the victory of Constantine over Maxentius was a military and political victory of Christianity over heathenism. The emblem of ignominy and oppression* became thenceforward the badge of honor and dominion, and was invested, in the emperor's view, according to the spirit of the Church of his day, with a magic virtue.† It now took the place of the eagle and other field-badges, under which the heathen Romans had conquered the world. It was stamped on the imperial coin, and on the standards, helmets, and shields of the soldiers. Among the standards the *labarum* shone above all in the richest decorations of gold and gems; was entrusted to the truest and bravest fifty of the body-guard; filled the Christians with the spirit of victory, and spread fear and terror among their enemies; until, under the weak successors of Theo-

* Cicero says, *pro Raberio*, c. 5: *Nomen ipsum crucis absit non modo a corpore civium Romanorum, sed etiam a cogitatione, oculis, auribus*. With other ancient heathens, however, the Egyptians, the Buddhists, and even the Aborigines of Mexico the cross seems to have been in use as a religious symbol. Socrates relates (*H. E. V. 1717*) that at the destruction of the temple of Serapis among the hieroglyphic inscriptions forms of crosses were found which pagans and Christians alike referred to their respective religions. According to Prescott (*Conquest of Mexico*, III, 338-340) the Spaniards found the cross among the objects of worship in the idol temples of Anahuac.

† Even church teachers, long before Constantine, Justin, Tertullian, Minucius Felix in downright opposition to this pagan antipathy, had found the sign of the cross everywhere on the face of nature and of human life; in the military banners and trophies of victory, in the ship with swelling sails and extended oars, in the plow, in the flying bird, in man swimming or praying, in the features of the face and the form of the body with outstretched arms. Hence the daily use of the sign of the cross by the early Christians.

dosius II., it fell out of use, and was lodged as a venerable relic in the imperial palace at Constantinople.

Before this victory at Rome, either in the spring or summer of 312, Constantine, in conjunction with his Eastern colleague, Licinius, had published an edict of religious toleration, now not extant, but probably a step beyond the edict of the still anti-Christian Galerius in 311, which was likewise subscribed by Constantine and Licinius, as co-regents. Soon after, in January, 313, the two emperors issued from Milan a new edict (the third) on religion, in which, in the spirit of religious eclecticism, they granted full freedom to all existing forms of worship with special reference to the Christian. This religion the edict not only recognized in its existing limits, but also—what neither the first nor perhaps the second edict had done—allowed every heathen subject to adopt it with impunity.* At the same time the church buildings and property confiscated in the Diocletian persecution were ordered to be restored, and private property-owners to be indemnified from the imperial treasury.

In this notable edict, however, we should look in vain for the modern Protestant and Anglo-American theory of religious liberty as one of the universal, inalienable rights of man. Sundry voices, it is true, in the Christian Church itself, at that time and even before, declared firmly against all compulsion in religion.† But the spirit of the Roman

* *Hæc ordinanda esse credidimus, ut daremus et Christianis et omnibus liberam potestatem sequendi religionem, quam quisque voluisset . . . ut nulli omnino facultatem obnegandam putaremus, qui vel observationi Christianorum, vel ei religioni mentem suam dederet, quam ipse sibi aptissimam esse sentiret . . . ut amotis omnibus omnino conditionibus (by which are meant, no doubt, the restrictions of toleration in the two former edicts)—nunc libere ac simpliciter unusquisque eorum qui eandem observandæ religioni Christianorum gerunt voluntatem, citra ullam inquietudinem et molestantiam sui id ipsum observare contendant.* Lact.: *De mort. persec.* c. 48 (p. 282 ed. Fritzsche). Eusebius gives the edict in a stiff and an obscure Greek translation, with some variations, *H. E. X. 5.* Comp. also Niceph. *H. E. VIII. 41.*

† Here comes in some remarkable passages of Tertullian, and Justin Martyr. Lactantius likewise, in the beginning of the fourth century, says, *Instit. div. I. V. c. 19* (I. p. 267 sq. ed. Lips.): *Non est opus vi et injuria, quia religio cogi non potest; verbis potius, quam verberibus res agenda est, ut sit voluntas. . . Defendenda religio est, non occidendo, sed moriendo; non saevitia,*

empire was too absolutistic to abandon the prerogative of a supervision of public worship. The Constantinian toleration was a temporary measure of state policy which, as indeed the edict expressly states the motive, promised the greatest security to the public peace and the protection of all the heavenly powers for emperor and empire. It was, as the result teaches, but the necessary transition-step to a new order of things. It opened the door to the elevation of Christianity, and specifically of Catholic hierachical Christianity, with its exclusiveness towards heretical and schismatic sects, to be the religion of the State. For, once put on equal footing with heathenism, it must soon, in spite of numerical minority, bear away the victory from a religion, which had already inwardly outlived itself.

From this time Constantine decidedly favored the Church, though without persecuting or forbidding the pagan religions. He always mentions the Christian Church with reverence in his imperial edicts, and uniformly applies to it, as we have already observed, the predicate of catholic. For only as a catholic, thoroughly organized, firmly compacted, and conservative institution did it meet his rigid monarchical interest, and afford the splendid state and court dress he wished for his empire. So early as the year 313 we find the bishop Hosius of Cordova among his counsellors, and heathen writers ascribe to the bishop even a magical influence over the emperor. Lactantius, also, and Eusebius of Caesarea belonged to his confidential circle. He exempted the Christian clergy from military and municipal duty (March, 313); abolished various customs and ordinances offensive to the Christians (315); facilitated the emancipation of Christian slaves (before 316); legalized bequests to Catholic churches (321); enjoined the civil observance of Sunday, though not as *dies Domini*, but as *dies Solis*, in conformity to his worship of Apollo, and in

sed patientia; non scelere, sed fide. . . Nam si sanguine, si tormentis, si malo religionem defendere velis, jam non defendetur illa, sed polluetur atque violabitur. Nihil est enim tam voluntarium, quam religio, in qua si animus sacrificantis aversus est, jam sublata, jam nulla est. Comp. c. 20.

company with an ordinance for the regular consulting of the haruspex (321); contributed liberally to the building of churches and the support of the clergy; erased the heathen symbols of Jupiter and Apollo, Mars and Hercules from the imperial coins (323); and gave his sons a Christian education. This mighty example was followed, as might be expected, by a general transition of those subjects, who were more influenced in their conduct by outward circumstances, than by inward conviction and principle. The story that in one year (324) twelve thousand men, with women and children in proportion, were baptized in Rome, and that the emperor had promised to each convert a white garment and twenty pieces of gold, is at least in accordance with the spirit of that reign, though the fact itself, in all probability, is greatly exaggerated.*

Constantine came out with still greater decision when, by his victory over his Eastern colleague and brother-in-law, Licinius, he became sole head of the whole Roman empire. To strengthen his position, Licinius had gradually placed himself at the head of the heathen party, still very numerous and had vexed the Christians first with wanton ridicule,† then with exclusion from civil and military office, with banishment, and in some instances perhaps even with bloody persecution. This gave the political strife for the monarchy, between himself and Constantine, the character also of a war of religions; and the defeat of Licinius in the battle of Adrianople in July, 324, and at Chalcedon in September, was a new triumph of the standard of the cross over the sacrifices of the gods. Save that Constantine dishonored himself and his cause by the execution of Licinius and his son.

The emperor now issued a general exhortation to his subjects to embrace the Christian religion, still leaving them, however, to their own free conviction. In the year 325,

* For the *Acta S. Silvestri* and the *H. Eccl. of Nicephorus Callist. VII.* 34 (in *Baronius, ad ann. 324*) are of course not reliable authority on this point.

† He commanded the Christians, for example, to hold their large assemblies in open fields, instead of in the churches, because the fresh air was more wholesome for them than the close atmosphere in a building.

as patron of the Church, he summoned the council of Nice, and himself attended it; banished the Arians, though he afterwards recalled them; and, in his monarchical spirit of uniformity, showed great zeal for the settlement of all theological disputes, while he was blind to their deep significance. In the year 325-329, in connection with his mother, Helena, he erected magnificent Churches on the sacred spots in Jerusalem.

As heathenism had still the preponderance in Rome, where it was hallowed by its great traditions, Constantine, by divine command as he supposed,* in the year 330 transferred the seat of his government to Byzantium, and thus fixed the policy, already initiated by Domitian, of orientalizing and dividing the empire. With incredible rapidity, and by all the means within reach of an absolute monarch, he turned this nobly situated town, connecting two seas and two continents, into a splendid residence and a new Christian Rome, "for which now," as Gregory of Nazianzen expresses it, "sea and land emulate each other, to load it with their treasures, and crown it queen of cities," Here instead of idol temples and altars, churches and crucifixes rose; though among them the statues of patron deities from all over Greece, mutilated by all sorts of tasteless adaptations, were also gathered in the new metropolis.† The main hall in the palace was adorned with representations of the crucifixion and other biblical scenes. The gladiatorial shows, so popular in Rome, were forbidden here, though theatres, amphitheatres, and hippodromes kept their place. It could nowhere be mistaken, that the

* "Jubente Deo," says he in one of his laws. Cod. Theodos. I. XIII. tit. V. leg. 7. Later writers ascribe the founding of Constantinople to a nocturnal vision of the emperor, and an injunction of the Virgin Mary, who was revered as patroness, one might almost suppose as goddess, of the city.

† The most offensive of these is the colossal bronze statue of Apollo, pretended to be the work of Phidias, which Constantine set up in the middle of the forum on a pillar of porphyry, a hundred and twenty feet high, and which, at least, according to later interpretations, served to represent the emperor himself with the attributes of Christ and the god of the sun! So says the author of *Antiquit. Constant. in Banduri, and J. v. Hammer: Constantinopolis u. der Bosphorus*, I, 162 (cited by Milman on Gibbon). Nothing now remains of the pillar, but a mutilated piece.

new imperial residence was as to all outward appearances a Christian city.

The emperor diligently attended divine worship, and is portrayed upon medals in the posture of prayer. He kept the Easter vigils with great devotion. He would stand during the longest sermons of his bishops, who always surrounded him, and unfortunately flattered him only too much. And he even himself composed and delivered discourses to his court. One of these productions is still extant,† in which he recommends Christianity in a characteristic strain and in proof of its divine origin cites especially the fulfillment of prophecy, including the Sibylline books and the Fourth Eclogue of Virgil, with the contrast between his own happy and brilliant reign and the tragical fate of his persecuting predecessors and colleagues.

Nevertheless he continued in his later years quite true to the toleration principles of the edict of 313, protected the pagan priests and temples in their privileges, and wisely abstained from all violent measures against heathenism, in the persuasion, that it would in time die out. Save that he prohibited idolatry, in cases where it sanctioned scandalous immorality, as in the obscene worship of Venus in Phenicia; or in places, which were specially sacred to the Christians, as the sepulchre of Christ and the grove of Mamre; and he caused a number of deserted temples and images to be destroyed or turned into Christian Churches. Though he loved to promote Christians to honorable positions, yet he retained many heathens at court and in public office. In his later years he seems, indeed, to have issued a general prohibition of idolatrous sacrifice; his sons in 341 refer to such an edict; but the repetition of it by his successors proves, that, if issued, it was not carried into execution under his reign.

With this shrewd, cautious, and moderate policy of Constantine, which contrasts well with the violent fanaticism of his sons, accords perhaps his postponement of his

† *Const. Oratio ad sanctos.*

own baptism to his last sickness. § For this he had the further motives of a superstitious desire, which he himself expresses, to be baptized in the Jordan, whose waters were sanctified by the Saviour, and no doubt also a fear, that he might by relapse forfeit the sacramental remission of sins. It is therefore the more striking, that the court bishops, from false prudence, relaxed in his favor the otherwise strict discipline of the Church and admitted him, at least tacitly, to the enjoyment of nearly all the privileges of believers, before he had taken upon himself even a single obligation of a catechumen. But when after a life of almost uninterrupted health, he felt the approach of death, he was received into the number of catechumens by laying on of hands, and then formally admitted by baptism into the full communion of the Church in the year 337, the sixty-fifth year of his age, by the Arian (or properly Semi-Arian) bishop Eusebius of Nicomedia. || He promised to live thenceforth worthily of a disciple of Jesus; refused to wear again the imperial mantle of cunningly woven silk richly ornamented with gold; retained the white baptismal robe; and died a few days after, on Pentecost (May 22, 337), trusting in the mercy of God, and leaving a long, a fortunate, and a brilliant reign, such as none but Augustus of all his predecessors had enjoyed. His remains were

§ The pretended baptism of Constantine by the Roman bishop Sylvester in 324, and his bestowment of lands on the pope in connection with it, is a mediæval fiction, still unblushingly defended indeed by Baronius (ad ann. 324, No. 43-49), but long since given up by other Roman Catholic historians, such as Noris, Tillemont, and Valesius. It is sufficiently refuted by the contemporary testimony of Eusebius alone [Vit. Const. IV, 61, 62] who places the baptism of Constantine at the end of his life, and minutely describes it; and Sozomen, Sozomen, Ambrose and Jerome coincide with him.

|| Hence Jerome says, Constantine was baptized into Arianism. But Eusebius [not the Church historian] was probably the nearest bishop, and acted here not as a party leader; Constantine, too, in spite of the influence, which the Arians had over him in his later years, considered himself constantly a true adherent of the Nicene faith. The deeper significance of the dogmatic controversy was entirely beyond his sphere. Gibbon is right in this matter: "The credulous monarch, unskilled in the stratagems of theological warfare, might be deceived by the modest and specious professions of the heretics, whose sentiments he never perfectly understood; and while he protected Arius, and persecuted Athanasius, he still considered the council of Nice as the bulwark of the Christian faith, and the peculiar glory of his own reign." C. XXI.

removed from Nicomedia to Constantinople, and deposited, with the highest Christian honors, in the Church of the Apostles, while the Roman senate, after its ancient pagan custom, enrolled him among the gods. Soon after his death, Eusebius set him above the greatest princes of all times; from the fifth century he began to be recognized in the East as a saint; and the Greek and Russian Church to this day celebrates his memory under the extravagant title of the "equal of the apostles."¶ The Latin Church, on the contrary, with truer tact, has never placed him among the saints, but has been content with naming him "the Great."

P. S.

ART. II.—THE OLD DOCTRINE OF CHRISTIAN BAPTISM.

I. *An Extract from the Twelfth Homily of St. John Chrysostom on the Gospel of St. Matthew.*

"And Jesus, when he was baptized, went up straightway out of the water; and lo, the heavens were opened unto him." Why were the heavens opened? In order that thou mightest learn, that when thou also art baptized the same thing takes place, God calling thee to the country above and urging thee to forsake the fellowship of earth. That thou seest it not, is no reason why thou shouldst not believe it. For it is the general rule, that in the beginning of extraordinary spiritual dispensations such sensible visions and signs should appear, because men are so slow to perceive spiritual realities, and require to have their attention roused by things which strike the senses; in order that even without the same signs afterwards, the

¶ Comp. the *Acta Sanct.* ad 21 Maii, p. 18 sq.

things once certified by them may be accepted as sure by faith. Thus upon the apostles, we are told, there came the sound of a mighty rushing wind and the appearance of cloven tongues of fire; not for their sake, however, but on account of the Jews then present. Though there be then no visible signs, let us still receive what they have once served to reveal. For the dove also appeared at this time, that it might as a seal designate to those present, and to John, the Son of God. And not for this only, but to teach thee also that the Spirit descends upon thee in like manner at thy baptism. We have no longer need of the sensible vision, faith answering for all; for signs are "not for them that believe, but for them that believe not."

But why in the form of a dove? It is a gentle and pure animal. And so the Holy Ghost, as a spirit of meekness, takes its appearance. There is regard in it besides to ancient history. For when the general flood was upon the earth, threatening to make full shipwreck of the human race this bird appeared, announcing the end of the storm, and with the olive branch proclaimed the glad tidings of peace upon the earth; all which was a type of things to come.

As then indeed matters were in much worse state than now, and men deserving of far greater punishment. That thou mayest, not despair then, call to mind that history. For even in that desperate extremity there was a certain relief and restoration; then however through punishment, whereas it is now through grace and unspeakable gift. On which account also the dove appears, not bearing a branch of olive, but pointing out to us the deliverer from all evils, and holding forth to us heavenly hopes. A messenger, not to bring one man out from the ark, but to conduct the whole world to heaven, offering to the race at large instead of an olive branch the precious boon of adoption. Considering then the greatness of the gift, let not the dignity of the giver seem any less great in thine eyes from his appearing in such form. For I hear some say, that as much difference as there is between a man and a dove, so much there is also between Christ and the Spirit, since the

one appeared in our nature and the other in the form of a dove. But what must we say now in answer to this? That the Son of God did indeed take upon him the nature of man; but that the Spirit did *not* assume the nature of the dove. Hence the evangelist also does not say, in the nature of a dove, but in the form of a dove; in which form, accordingly, the Spirit appeared only at that time, and not afterwards. But if this be taken to imply inferiority, the cherubim by parity of reasoning will be found to be likewise of higher dignity, in proportion as an eagle is superior to a dove; as being fashioned to such likeness; and the angels again must be counted higher also, since they have often appeared in human form. The truth, however, is widely different from all this. The reality of a dispensation is one thing, the accommodation of a transient vision altogether another. Be not ungrateful, therefore, toward thy benefactor, and think not poorly of him who has bestowed upon thee the fountain of blessedness. For where the dignity of sonship is, there the removal of all evil is also, and the gift of all good.

The completion of the Jewish baptism thus is the beginning of ours; and what took place in the case of the passover, happens also in this case. For there one transaction is made to embrace both the old and the new, in such a way as to abolish the one and introduce the other; and here, having fulfilled the Jewish baptism, he at the same time opens the doors of the Church, as in one table there, so in one river here, filling out at once the shadow and adding to it the truth. For this baptism alone has the grace of the Spirit; that of John was destitute of this gift. Hence nothing of the sort occurred in the case of the others who came to his baptism, but only in the case of him who was to bestow this; showing it to be thus, not from the sanctity of the baptizer, but from the power of the person baptized. Then also, accordingly, the heavens were opened, and the Spirit descended. For from this time he leads us forth from the old into the new order of life, both opening for us the celestial gates, and sending his Spirit from

thence to call us to the country above; and not simply to call us, but to do this also with the most exalted honor. For he has not made us angels and archangels, but constituting us sons and beloved of God, he draws us thus toward that inheritance.

Considering then all these things, show a life worthy at once of him that calls thee, and of the heavenly citizenship, and of the honor thou hast received. Being crucified to the world, and having it crucified for thyself, cultivate the life of heaven with all diligence; neither suffer thyself to think, that because thy body has not yet passed into that higher world thou hast anything in common with this earth; for thou hast thy head seated above. And for this reason, the Lord, having come here first attended with angels, when he had taken thee into union with himself afterwards returned on high, in order that thou mightst learn even before thy ascent thither, how it is possible for thee to occupy the earth as heaven. Let us continue then to hold fast the nobility which we have received from the beginning, and let us seek every day those royal abodes, holding all things here as a mere shadow and dream. For if only an earthly king, finding thee poor and begging, should suddenly make thee his son, thou wouldst not surely make account of thy hovel and its mean provision; although the difference in that case would not be so very great. Here then also make no account of things before; since thou hast been called to far greater things. For he that calls is the Lord of angels, and the benefits given exceed all utterance and thought. He doth not translate thee from earth to earth, as a king might do, but from earth to heaven, and from a mortal nature to immortality and glory unspeakable, which can only then fully appear when we come into its possession. Being about to partake of such blessings, then, dost thou make mention to me of riches, and cleave to the show of this world? And canst thou refuse to look upon all things visible as more mean than the beggar's rags? How then shalt thou appear worthy of that honor; and what defence shalt thou have to make or rather what

punishment shalt thou not endure, having returned from such a gift to thy former vomit. For not now as a man simply shalt thou be punished, but as a son of God falling into sin, and the greatness of thy dignity will be for thee the passport to greater indignation. As we ourselves also do not inflict the same punishment on offending servants, as upon our children offending in the same way; especially if these have received large favors at our hands. If he who possessed paradise, was made to suffer so many dire evils, for one disobedience, after such high distinction, what indulgence shall *we* have—we who have possessed heaven and have been made fellow heirs with the Beloved—if after the dove we betake ourselves to the serpent? We shall not hear any more, “Dust thou art and unto dust shalt thou return,” “Till the ground,” and those other words of the former curse, but things much more grievous than these, outer darkness, eternal chains, the undying worm, the gnashing of teeth. And with good reason. For he that is not made better by so great favor, should of right suffer the last and heaviest punishment.

Elias of old opened and shut heaven, so as to bring down and to hold back rain; but for thee heaven is opened not thus, but so as that thou mayest thyself ascend thither; and what is still greater, so as that thou canst not only thyself ascend, but if thou wilt mayest bring others there also, such liberty and power hath he given unto thee in all that is his own. Since then our home is there, let us there lay up all things and leave nothing here, that we may not suffer loss. For here, though thou mayest apply keys, and use bolted doors, and have thousands of servants to watch, and though thou shouldst surmount the arts of the dishonest and avoid the eyes of the envious, and though thou shouldst escape the moth and the decay that comes by time, which is impossible—still thou wilt not therefore escape death at last, and all these things shall be taken from thee in the twinkling of an eye; and not only taken away, but often so left as to pass into unfriendly hands. But pass all into that higher home, and thou shall be master of all. No

keys, no doors no bolts are needed there; such is the strength of that city; so inviolable is the region, and so completely beyond the reach of all corruption and evil.

How is it not then the extreme of folly, to heap up all where that which is laid away is sure to dissolve and perish while not even the smallest part is placed there, where what is stored is not only safe but certain to become more—and this too, when we are to spend there our whole future life! Hence it is, that the Greeks also refuse to believe the things spoken by us; for they choose to make account of what we do, rather than of what we say; and when they see us building splendid houses, constructing gardens and baths, and buying fields, they will not believe that we are preparing for removal to another country. Since if that were the case, they say, we would see them converting all things here into money, and sending it there beforehand; and this they infer from what is usual in the present world. For we find always that those who have means employ them to purchase houses, and fields, and all other things, in those countries especially where they expect to remain. But we act differently; the earth, which we are to leave in a little while, is sought with the greatest diligence, not only money but blood itself being sacrificed for some acres of land and a few houses; whereas for the purchase of heaven we grudge to spend even our superfluous means, though we can have it at low price, and if we buy it are to hold it forever. For this reason the heaviest punishment awaits us if we pass into the other world naked and poor; and not for our own poverty simply, but for what we do also to make others poor, shall we meet severe retribution. For when the Greeks see those who have enjoyed such mysteries taken up with these things, they will much more cleave to the present world themselves. In this way we heap much fire on our own heads. For when we, who ought to teach them to despise all visible things, ourselves most of all encourage them in the love of these things, when may we hope to be saved, being held accountable for the destruction of others? Dost thou

not hear Christ saying, that he has sent us forth to be for salt and as lights in this world, that we may exert a preserving power in the midst of its corruption, and shine in the midst of its darkness. But if, instead of this, we help to draw men into darkness, and promote their corruption, what hope can there be of our salvation? None whatever; but with wailing and gnashing of teeth, bound hand and foot, we shall go away into hell-fire, after having been thoroughly consumed by the care of riches here. Considering then all these things, let us break the bands of such present delusion, that we may not fall into those which shall consign us to unquenchable fire hereafter. For whosoever serveth riches, shall be subjected to bonds both in this world and eternally in the next; but he that is freed from this desire, shall find liberty both here and there. Which that we also may obtain, breaking the heavy yoke of avarice, let us wing our souls for heaven, through the merciful kindness of our Lord Jesus Christ; to whom be glory and power through all ages. Amen.

II. PRACTICAL REFLECTIONS.

It is easy to see from this passage, that Christian Baptism was held by Chrysostom to be an actual regeneration, by the grace of God, to the power of a new and heavenly life. It was no sign simply of a spiritual fact, supposed to have place at some other time or in some other way; the token of an inward change already past, or the pledge of an inward change which was yet to come. It was not an act of profession merely, by which the catechumen became bound to the service of Christ, in the sense of what is called a church covenant among modern Congregationalists. The force of the sacrament was not subjective only, holding in the convictions and purposes, the views and feelings generally, of the human parties engaged in the transaction; it was at the same time most really and truly objective also, carrying with it the power of God's grace, and making what it signified to be actually at hand for its subjects, and available for their use thenceforward, as it had not been before.

All this is regarded as flowing necessarily from the relation, which the baptism of Christ himself sustained to the Jewish use of the ordinance, advanced to its highest meaning in the ministry of John. The whole Jewish system was typical and prefigurative of things to come; it was not itself the substance of what it exhibited in the way of grace, but only its shadow and promise; and this character it retained on to the very last. Even in the person of its last and greatest representative, the immediate forerunner of the Messiah, its mission was still that of preparation only, showing the kingdom of heaven to be indeed at hand, but at hand after all in a form wholly different from itself. Greater than all born before him in the old order of things, the Baptist was at the same time, we are told, less than the least in the new order which was now about to take its place. His baptism thus had no power answerable to the proper spiritual significance of all such washing; it ended in being nothing more than a sign and type; there was no efficacy in it to take away sin. Of this no one was more sensible than John himself. "I indeed baptize you with water," he says, "unto repentance"—engaging you to confession of sin, and to such change of mind as may fit you to receive the grace by which sin is to be pardoned and taken out of the way—"but he that cometh after me," whose way I am sent to prepare, in whom all my ministry is to find its full sense and end, "is mightier than I; whose shoes I am not worthy to bear: he shall baptize you with the Holy Ghost and with fire." In other words, his baptism shall be in full effect what mine is in shadow only and outward form; it will be not the symbolical washing of water only, but along with this the power of inward purification also by the Holy Ghost, which is needed to make the symbol complete. This relation of the two different kinds of baptism, that of the Baptist and that for which it was to prepare the way, comes strikingly into view in the history of what took place, when Jesus came to be himself baptized of John in the river Jordan.

It became him thus "to fulfil all righteousness," to take

up into his own person the last sense of the Old Testament, and so to complete it and bring it to an end, while at the same time he brought in the higher reality itself in the presence of which the preparatory shadow was to pass away. Such is the general relation of the New Testament to the Old; Christianity appears in one view as the true historical continuation of Judaism, its legitimate outbirth, in which the peculiar significance of it is carried forward finally to its last result, and yet in another view it is the introduction of an absolutely new creation, transcending the measure of that old economy altogether, and turning it into mere figure and show. The baptism of John became thus, in the case of Christ, something far more than it had been in its own nature previously as applied to others. The Baptist saw his work as it were taken out of his hands, and carried forward by the intervention of another ministry infinitely higher than his own. The coming down of the Holy Ghost was the inauguration of a new baptism, a new order of truth and grace, which served to proclaim at once the advent of him whose way he was sent to prepare. "I knew him not," we hear him saying, "but he that sent me to baptize with water, the same said unto me, Upon whom thou shalt see the Spirit descending and remaining on him, the same is he which baptizeth with the Holy Ghost." The new dispensation joins itself historically with the old, in the earthly ministration of John; but it is at once borne immeasurably above it, and beyond it, by another ministration, which comes not from earth at all, but directly and wholly from heaven. So much the transaction itself was clearly intended to signify and represent. "The heavens were opened," it is said—making way for a supernatural revelation which was not in the world before—"and he saw the Spirit of God descending like a dove, and lighting upon him"—entering into his person and abiding with him: "and lo, a voice from heaven saying, This is my beloved Son, in whom I am well pleased."

The relation between the old and the new here, according to Chrysostom, is parallel with what had place at the

institution of the Lord's Supper, the other Christian sacrament; when the celebration of the Jewish Passover was made the occasion of substituting for the type, the glorious reality which it foreshadowed from the beginning. As that transaction was made to embrace both the Jewish feast and the Christian, abolishing the one by completion, and introducing the other as a new and higher fact; so here also, "having fulfilled the Jewish baptism, he at the same time opens the doors of the Church, as in one table there, so in one river here, filling out at once the shadow and adding to it the truth."

It is easy enough, however, to own this difference between the baptism of John and what was superadded to it in the case of Christ, without any faith after all in the divine power of the Christian sacrament in its ordinary form. It may be allowed, that our Saviour's baptism did indeed inaugurate the kingdom of heaven, showing that the way was now open for spiritual influences to descend upon men as they had not been known before; but this may be regarded at the same time as having place, mainly if not exclusively, under the form of a purely inward baptism, which is then taken to be the proper sense of the Christian sacrament as analogically set forth in the transaction of Jordan, while the outward rite of the sacrament is considered to be only the symbol of this grace, having no more necessary connection with the real presence of the grace itself, in the end, than the Old Testament baptism of John. But no such Gnostic apprehension as this was admitted in the mind of Chrysostom. He sees in the transaction of Jordan a revelation, not only of the power of the Holy Ghost, as it was to be exercised by Christ in a general spiritual way for the salvation of his people, but of this power as it was supposed to enter now into the constitution of all Christian baptism, making the sacrament to be as a whole something altogether different from what he depreciates in his own ministry as being a baptism of water only and nothing more. The Christian sacrament includes in itself really and truly, according to St. Chrysostom, what the

other served only to prefigure as a weak outward sign ; it carries with it the power of the Holy Ghost, answering in full to what took place at our Saviour's baptism, when the heavens were opened, and the Spirit came down in bodily shape upon his person.

The opening of the heavens on this grand occasion, he tells us, is to be regarded as a representation of what takes place in the sacrament of Christian baptism through all time. It matters not that the visibility of the fact is not repeated ; that, like the sensible manifestations of the Day of Pentecost, was only to verify the commencement of the dispensation ; for faith now, the mystery, once evidenced in this way, remains permanently sure, without the help of sense. In all Christian Baptism then, there is a real rending of the heavens—the canopy that separates the world of nature from the world of grace ; way is made for the saving presence of the Spirit as it was not at hand before ; an adoption takes place into the family of God—the constitution of a new filial relation, or sonship, which did not exist previously ; and along with this goes the power of a divine vocation, a “voice from heaven,” calling the favored subject of the ordinance to forsake the present world and seek the heavenly inheritance, and offering at the same time all the grace that is required to obey the call.

It will not do to say, that these high sounding representations are with Chrysostom mere rhetorical figures, employed to set forth the general privilege of those to whom the Gospel comes with its offers of mercy ; the meaning of which must be reduced simply to this, that baptism certifies to men the great fact of the Christian salvation, and the possibility of their having part in it by repentance, faith, and new obedience—a possibility, however, which is in no sense conditioned by what takes place in this sacrament itself, but is to be considered equally open and nigh in fact to all who have the gospel preached to them, whether baptized or not. What is here affirmed, or rather we may say taken for granted, of the Christian sacrament, goes

most manifestly very far beyond all that. The privileges and prerogatives of its subjects, while they are taken to be of the highest supernatural significance and most real objective force, are viewed at the same time as exclusively peculiar, the result strictly of that new position to which the baptized have come by means of the sacrament itself, and in no sort something common to them with the unbaptized world around. All men to whom the gospel is preached have the opportunity of being saved, and may be said to be placed thus within the range of the heavenly economy, by which it is made possible for sinners to become the children of God, and to enter into everlasting life; and this undoubtedly is a great distinction and privilege, which it must ever be a sin like that of Esau to undervalue or neglect. But here we have the idea of vastly more than this. Baptism is for its subjects not simply an expressive sign, picturing to the mind the sense of that general grace, which is offered to all, and which all are bound to receive; it is an actual election and vocation of God to gracious privileges, heavenly relations, special possibilities and powers of salvation, which are not at once comprehended in the general presence of Christianity. The subjects of it are brought into a new condition or state, broadly different from that of the general world around them. For others the presence of the Gospel is simply the opportunity of coming into the Christian fold in this way, and thus securing to themselves the rights and faculties of the kingdom of heaven; but for those who are in the fold by baptism these rights and faculties are already actually possessed; they have the power of being saved, not mediately only and through something else, as in the other case, but immediately in their position itself; a difference exactly like that of being in the ark, in the days of Noah, and of being only warned and called to take refuge in it from the impending flood.

It never could have entered into the mind of Chrysostom, to address the world at large in the language of Christian instruction and exhortation. His homilies are not for men

in general, congregations composed promiscuously of baptized and unbaptized ; they are properly speaking for the baptized alone ; regard being had to others at best only as they had already become catechumens and candidates for baptism ; while all besides were viewed as unbelievers, for whom the doctrines, promises, and precepts of Christianity could not be said to be of any practical account whatever. For all such it could have but one message still, as on the Day of Pentecost : "Repent, and be baptized every one of you in the name of Jesus Christ, for the remission of sins, and ye shall receive the gift of the Holy Ghost." Without this first great act of submission to the heavenly constitution of the Church, they must be held to be spiritually incompetent for all the privileges and duties of Christianity beyond this ; so that it could be only a sort of profane mockery to make such duties and privileges the matter of homiletic exhortation for them in any way. Full earnest is made thus with the distinction, between being in the Church and being out of the Church. The difference is taken to be not simply nominal, but in the most material sense actual and real.

Baptism, in the view of Chrysostom, is not merely a public profession of faith in Christ, but the act of putting on Christ and entering into the fellowship of his kingdom ; a translation from the power of darkness into the marvellous light of the Gospel ; a new birth, bringing with it the title and power of sonship in the family of God ; which is such a dignity again as brings with it, we are told, "the removal of all evil and the gift of all good"—the remission of sin, in other words, and whatever of grace is needed for securing everlasting life.

But with all the account which is thus made of the sacrament, as being the gate of paradise, the mystery of regeneration, and the very power of God unto salvation, we do not find the opinion entertained for a moment that it was sufficient of itself to insure the salvation of those who were its subjects. On the contrary, it is everywhere taken for

granted, that it carried with it no such assurance whatever. Every homily of St. Chrysostom proceeds upon the assumption, that those who were baptized, and thus made the children of God and the heirs of eternal life, might notwithstanding abuse this grace, allow themselves to continue still in the service of sin, and so come short of heaven at the last. It is painfully apparent indeed from his own discourses, that the great body of those to whom he himself preached, as the regenerated subjects of Christian baptism, were Christians in outward form and name only, whose walk and conversation, instead of adorning the doctrine of Christ, brought reproach upon it every day. He goes even so far as to say in one place, that too generally they were not to be distinguished from the unconverted world around them at all, except when they were seen to approach the sacramental altar. Hence in our present extract also, we find him turning what he conceives to be the unspeakable gift that goes along with Christian baptism, into an occasion for apprehension and alarm for those who enjoy it, in view of the possibility of its not being properly improved. As partakers of the heavenly adoption, they may still destroy themselves by sin; in which case, however, their perdition must be something worse than that of men who perish without having enjoyed the same high distinction. "What defence shalt thou have to make, or rather what punishment shalt thou not endure, having returned from such a gift to thy former vomit? For not now as a man simply shalt thou be punished, but as a son of God falling into sin, and the greatness of that dignity will be for thee the passport to greater indignation." "If he who possessed paradise was made to suffer so many dire evils for one disobedience, after such high distinction, what indulgence shall *we* have—we who have possessed heaven, and have been made fellow heirs with the Beloved—if after the dove we betake ourselves to the serpent?" The entire exhortation proceeds throughout on the supposition, not only that it was possible for those who were thus constituted the children of God to lose the benefit of

their supernatural birthright, and to make shipwreck of their souls, but that there was in truth great danger always of such disaster, that it was sadly frequent and common, and that it needed all diligence to avoid it, so as to make the Christian calling and election finally sure.

But still this view of the matter is not allowed in the least to discredit, or bring into doubt, the objective reality and significance of the grace conferred by baptism. This it is precisely that is taken to be the ground of special condemnation, in the case of those who have enjoyed that grace and yet yield themselves to the power of sin. What aggravates their guilt, is not just that they have had the gospel preached to them, that they have been placed under a general dispensation of mercy, that they have enjoyed the opportunity of embracing and using the means of salvation; nor yet, farther than this, that they have taken upon them the profession of Christianity, assumed its engagements, and joined in its solemn acts of worship; but that they have been made actually to possess the gift of righteousness, the power of salvation, that a price to purchase heaven has been fairly placed in their hands, and that notwithstanding all this they have forced their way down to everlasting death. This is the condemnation. Having been constituted the children of God, by adoption in Christ, they have despised that glorious birthright, and allowed themselves to become again the children of the Devil. Having been washed from their sins, they have returned to wallowing in the mire. Having been called to holiness, and endowed with power from on high to follow after it to the end, they have turned aside to unrighteousness, and profaned the heavenly gift in the service of sin.

What is particularly remarkable, is the facility with which these contrary and seemingly inconsistent conceptions are thus constantly held together in the same system of thought, over against such an order of things as is known to have prevailed at the time in the outward Church. The notion of baptismal grace was apparently contradicted every day by the notorious fact, that the greater part of the

baptized gave no evidence whatever of being in any better condition for the purposes of Christian piety, than multitudes around them who had never enjoyed the same heavenly privilege. How could that be a supernatural regeneration in any sense, a birth into God's family by the power of the Holy Ghost, which allowed its subjects to continue still the willing slaves of Satan and sin? Was not the lie given continually to Chrysostom's theory of sacramental saintship, by the crowd of professed believers, called in this way to be saints, whom he himself describes as patterns of selfishness and covetousness; examples of all worldliness; pleasure seekers, who could run from the church to the theatre, and there feast their eyes, and pollute their imagination, with licentious heathen spectacles and shows; brawlers, profane swearers, worshippers that carried the poison of asps under their tongues even in the sanctuary itself, blessing God and cursing man almost in the same breath, and filling the temple with noise and confusion in the very midst of the sacred services which were going forward at the altar? Such monstrous practice might indeed go along with a simply human profession. But did it not show, that the profession at last was human only, an act on the part of those who made it, and sealed it by the rite of baptism, and nothing more? Did it not make void at once the idea of any properly objective force in the sacrament, and demonstrate in the most convincing manner that the established ecclesiastical style of speaking on this subject—with its terminology of regeneration, illumination, initiation, divine filiation, donation of the Spirit, remission of sins, and other such high sounding benefits—was in truth rhetorical only, and in no sense in strict agreement with the truth? Must not Chrysostom himself have known, in full view of the facts before him, that his way of dealing with such terms was more oratorical than logical; that he was discoursing of what ought to be in the case rather than of what existed in fact; that the outward symbols of the Christian salvation were made in his view, for the moment, to pass for the proper spiritual

verities which it was their office only to represent? So it is natural to feel, in looking at the matter from the standpoint of what is considered to be spiritual Christianity at the present time. The case is found to involve a difficulty, at all events, which seems to demand some explanation; and we are apt to think, that such a man as Chrysostom must have felt himself constrained to take notice of it in some way. But, strange to say, it does not appear to give him any sort of embarrassment whatever. He moves along in his didactic and paraenetic course, as though no such obstruction crossed his path, or as though he at least had no eyes to note its presence. The modern dilemma in regard to baptismal regeneration, gore whom it may with its merciless horns, comes not at all apparently into his view. Both sides of the supposed difficulty are embraced in his thinking at once; and he passes back and forth from one to the other continually, without experiencing, as it would seem, the slightest sense of contradiction.

There is not the shadow of evidence anywhere, that the stress which he lays upon the heavenly side of Christian baptism was in his own mind a figure of speech only, substituting the sign for the thing signified, or allowing outward profession to pass for inward fact. Such a supposition would stultify his entire system of theological thought. In one view it might have been a relief to look at the matter in this light; as it would have served to show that the divine pretensions of Christianity were not to be tried or measured in any way by the unfruitful lives of bad nominal Christians, who as such must be considered hypocrites only, and not partakers at all of the proper supernatural power of the Gospel. But Chrysostom has no thought of saving the credit of the Church in this way. On the contrary, in full face of the acknowledged fact that thousands were all the time receiving the benefit in vain, he only insists the more upon the reality of the heavenly gift which was supposed to be conferred in baptism. That was not to be doubted or called in question, let it fare as it might with those who had received it. Let God be true, though all the world

should be found false ; his faith was not to be made of no effect, however widely it might be met with unfaithfulness on the part of men. The objective presence of the grace which was lodged in the Christian sacraments, must not be measured by mere outward observation of any kind ; it belonged to the sphere of faith, and was to be owned, therefore, independently of all experimental tests. To make it contingent on the purely subjective operations of the human mind, was necessarily to set aside the idea of its objective force altogether, and in the end to reduce Christianity to the character of a simply natural religion. If it might seem to be for the credit of the Gospel, to say that hypocrites and false professors had no part in its proper supernatural grace, and that *therefore* no argument could hold rightly against the reality and power of this grace, because it was found to have no salutary effect on their lives ; it was undoubtedly for the true credit of the Gospel much more, that it should not itself be shorn of its own heavenly prerogative, as a system whose province it was, not merely to shadow forth, but to embody and exhibit in a real way, the blessings of salvation. This was an interest which lay much nearer to the faith of Chrysostom than the other. The Gospel, in his view, was the power of a new order of life always actually at hand in the Church. Christian Baptism was in full effect, what the Baptism of John had been only in figure and sign ; it answered strictly to the contrast drawn by the Baptist himself, as being a baptism with the Holy Ghost and with fire in distinction from a baptism with water only. It opened the heavens ; brought down the Spirit ; wrought the remission of sins ; regenerated its subjects, by a divine adoption, into the state and dignity of children of God. And yet this grace, transcending as it did the whole course of nature, might be abused, wasted, and utterly thrown away by men, just like the common blessings of nature itself. Chrysostom finds no more difficulty apparently, in supposing it possible for the subjects of such supernatural calling and election to miss the end of their heavenly qualification, than in conceiving

it possible for those who are called and chosen, by real opportunity, to any simply worldly good, to come short of it in the same way ; a failure, which does not show then that there was no qualification in their circumstances for securing the benefit, but only that there was no care to turn the qualification to right account. So we have the two conceptions continually moving, as we have said before, hand in hand together ; without any sense of contradiction ; without any thought of explanation.

It will be borne in mind, that we are not at present sitting in judgment, in any way, on this view of Christian Baptism. Our object is simply to exhibit it, as the view that was held by St. Chrysostom, without any argument upon its theological merits.

The view, however, be its merits as they may, was in no sense peculiar to this eminently pious Church Father. It belonged to the universal orthodox Christian thinking of the age. And as we look farther, we find it in the thinking of previous ages also, back to the first Christian times. The ancient ecclesiastical Fathers are everywhere full of testimony on the subject. It is idle to quote particular authorities in the case ; for the authorities are all one way. The universal Church in these first centuries held and taught, that Christian Baptism was not simply "unto repentance," like that of John, not merely a sign to represent the profession of Christianity, on the one side, and the power of its cleansing and renovating grace on the other ; but that it was the very sacrament of this grace itself, the form of its first actual exhibition for the use of sinners, the power of God really and truly unto salvation, carrying with it the remission of sins, the gift of adoption, and the full possibility of eternal life. It was not pretended, that it secured the salvation of its subjects ; they might prove unfaithful to their heavenly calling, and destroy themselves still by a life of sin ; multitudes, it was too plain, were constantly falling into this condemnation ; but no consideration of this sort was allowed to disparage the supernatural

force of the sacrament itself. That remained an article of faith, under all circumstances, and in the face of all difficulties.

An article of faith, we say ; which as such, accordingly, entered with a kind of inward necessity into the whole system of theological thought with which it was joined. In this view it is especially, that the old ecclesiastical doctrine challenges serious attention. If it appeared as a mere accidental opinion simply, sustaining only an outward relation to the general faith of the Church, it might be comparatively easy to dispose of it as being the result in some way of a wrong use of terms. But for any one who is willing to examine the matter for himself, it is impossible not to see that the very reverse of this is the truth. The idea of baptismal regeneration, as involving a real translation from the kingdom of Satan into the family of God, underlies the universal religious thinking of the ancient Church. The old Patristic doctrine of Christian Baptism is clearly enough revealed, in particular passages bearing directly on the point. But such separate and special testimonies form in truth by far the smallest and least weighty part of the evidence, that properly belongs to the case. This comes out fully, only in the way in which all Christian truth and life are made to include the tacit assumption of the doctrine, as being a sort of fundamental axiom in Christianity. We can hardly read for instance a single homily of Chrysostom, without feeling that his view of the Gospel, as a scheme of redemption and salvation, is conditioned throughout by the conception of supernatural privileges and powers conferred upon men through the sacrament of Baptism. His theology is constructed, in all its parts, in the most perfect harmony with this thought. It is everywhere sacramental and churchly, in the fullest sense of the terms. And the same thing is true manifestly of the theology and religious life of the first Christian ages generally.

Have we not this fact, indeed, plainly exhibited in the structure of the ancient Creeds ? They were in one view

many; but the general tenor of them is always the same. They are in power and substance a single Creed; and this so constructed, as to be in itself a single whole, the organic evolution of one and the same grand fact from beginning to end. And here we find, conspicuous among its other articles, the doctrine of the Church and of "one Baptism for the remission of sins." What else is this than the sacramental theory of Chrysostom, and the old ecclesiastical writers generally? In no other view, indeed, could Christian Baptism be made an object of faith at all, in the sense of the Creed. For faith here, by its very conception, has to do with what is supernatural in Christianity, the objective presence and power of the new creation proceeding from Christ, in distinction from all subjective apprehension of it on the part of men. If Baptism then were not taken to be a mystery, hiding under its visible form, in the sphere of nature, the agency of God's Spirit working, at the same time, in a higher sphere, it could have no place properly in the Creed. The simple fact of its being there, as an article of faith, a primary constituent in the Christian salvation, is one of the clearest proofs we could well have of its being regarded all along in this light by the early Church.

That the view taken of Christian Baptism at the present time, in a very large part of the Protestant Church, is something broadly different from this, another theory of the sacrament in truth altogether, is too plain to admit of any question or to call for any proof. In the midst of much confusion in regard to what the ordinance positively does mean, there is a very general agreement in rejecting the meaning attributed to it by the Church of the first ages. The doctrine of St. Chrysostom on the subject is held to be unevangelical, and if he were alive to preach it now, would bring him into general discredit with all our evangelical sects. Whatever honor we may be bound to put upon the sacrament as a divine appointment, it must ever be a monstrous wrong, according to this reigning

modern view, to make it of one order in any way with the operation of God's Spirit, by ascribing to it effects that are supernatural, and such as it is the province of the Holy Ghost alone to produce.

It is absurd, we are told, and something at war with the true idea of religion, to suppose that any external rite of this sort should take away sin, or carry with it the power of regeneration. The proper spirituality of the Gospel, it is taken for granted, must always suffer, where Christianity is made to be thus formal and sacramental. Religion after all is an inward, spiritual transaction, between God and the soul ; which, as such, may go along with the outward forms of worship, imparting to them energy and life ; but which, at the same time, is not bound to them, or conditioned by them, in any really necessary way.

Baptism thus as an outward ceremony is one thing, and what it is used to represent is another thing altogether, which is supposed to have place fully on the outside of the sacrament, and apart from all virtue in it whatever. Christian baptism is indeed more than the baptism of John ; it regards as an accomplished fact, what this last anticipated only as something which was then still to come. It represents the grace of Christ as now actually at work in the world, through the Spirit, for the remission of sins and the conversion of souls. But in its relation to this grace, it is itself still only an outward washing with water, as much as was formerly the baptism of John. It has no saving efficacy in its own constitution ; no power to remove the guilt of past sin, or to regenerate children of Satan into children of God. It signifies this ; but only as a fact which must be spiritually experienced under another form. In the case of adults it should of right follow this experience, showing that it has already taken place—that the subjects of the ordinance, in other words, have already secured the spiritual reality of which it is the outward profession, are regenerated, justified, adopted into the household of faith, the citizenship of heaven, and in virtue of all this are entitled now to enter the visible Church in this

way, and so to become Christians in name as they are already Christians in fact. In the case of infants, the change may be supposed to precede the ordinance occasionally, or in some instances possibly to accompany it, by an act of sovereign power on the part of God; but more commonly it is to be considered as being still a sort of covenant possibility only, which is hopefully expected to issue in actual conversion at some future time. In any case, however, there may be no inward change at all, answering either prospectively or retrospectively to the outward sign. So with adults, who often profess religion in this way without any sense of its proper power; and so also with infants, vast numbers of whom, after baptism, grow up, and pass through life, plainly impenitent and unconverted to the end. In all such instances, the relation between the sacrament and the grace signified by it, is clearly shown to be nominal only and nothing more; and the broad example, with which we are thus continually confronted in such form, is held sufficient to show that this is in truth the character of the relation universally, and that it must ever be idle, therefore, to speak of baptism as being itself, in any real sense, the vehicle of grace or the power of a new birth to righteousness and life.

We merely state this view here, in general terms; as we have tried to state before the doctrine of the ancient Church. Our business is not now to discuss the actual merits of either theory. We wish only to place them in contrast, and to fix attention on the plain fact of their difference and contradiction. Such a difference, in a case whose bearings are so broad and profound, is justly entitled, we are very sure, to thoughtful consideration. It must ever argue a great want of seriousness, to regard it without interest or concern. It is not a matter, that we should be willing to have covered over with the mantle of historical ignorance. We are bound, in duty to ourselves, as well as in fidelity to the cause of religion, to bring the subject forward into the broad light of day, to converse

with it fairly and openly in its own form, to see and acknowledge in regard to it what is the actual truth. When this is done honestly and candidly, we can hardly fail to perceive that the fact thus brought into view, is one which demands explanation; and it will be felt at the same time, that what needs to be explained in the case is a question, not merely of theoretical curiosity, but of the greatest practical significance and account. Here are two widely different constructions of the religion of Jesus Christ. The sacramental system of the early Church, stands broadly opposed to the self-styled evangelical system of the present day, each protesting loudly against the other as an utter perversion of the true sense of the Gospel. Are they after all different versions only of the same faith? If so, how are their opposing modes of thought to be adjusted, so that we may have a right to be quiet and at rest in the modern theory, not ignoring the old, but looking it as a part of past history steadily in the face?

It will not do to say, there is no difficulty in the case; that the old view stands clearly condemned by the judgment of history itself; and that the truth is so plainly with the modern view, as to make it unnecessary for us to trouble ourselves with its justification. All *such* superiority to the claims of the problem is too easy, to deserve either confidence or respect. It demands a different solution. The conflict here is between forces, that are not simply imaginary but real. There are formidable difficulties on both sides. If the ecclesiastical system seem dangerous in one direction, we may not close our eyes to the fact that the evangelical system has its dangers also in another.

Without going into any wider view at present, it is easy enough to see, for example, what questionable consequences thrust themselves upon us, as naturally flowing from the modern purely spiritualistic theory of Christian Baptism. If the sacrament be only the outward sign of a spiritual transaction, which is in its own nature complete under another form altogether—which has no inward connection with the sign whatever, and which indeed as related to the

sign is purely ideal to such an extent that it may never become fact at all—it would seem certainly that no great stress should be laid upon the use of it in any way, and that it must always involve some jeopardy to the cause of true piety to suppose it dependent in the least upon any such form. Thus the Quakers, consistently enough, reject the outward sacrament altogether; it is for them a mere baptism of water; they will have only the baptism of the Spirit, which is a process that belongs by its very nature to the soul. This is an affectation of the highest order of spirituality; the dialectic counterpart and natural end of which, as we all know, is Socinian or Deistic Rationalism. Another less extreme, but for this very reason also less consistent, undervaluation of the outward sacrament, is exhibited in the ecclesiastical practice of the Baptists; who refuse to baptize infants, on the ground that they have no power to repent and believe in Christ, so as to be the subjects of that inward spiritual conversion of which baptism is the profession and sign, and without which it can have no meaning. What conclusion, indeed, can well be more logical, if we are to believe that there is no objective power, no supernatural grace, in the sacrament itself, and that the whole virtue of it resolves itself at last into what goes forward in the minds of its subjects themselves under a purely subjective form? With such a theory of the institution, it is perfectly certain that the practice of infant baptism never could have prevailed as it did in the ancient Church. It belongs to the old order of thinking on the subject, as we have it in St. Chrysostom and the Christian fathers generally, which made baptism to be the sacrament of a real régénération by the power of the Holy Ghost into the family of God. Why then should it not be given up, along with this, as an obsolete superstition? It is becoming but too plain, that the Paedobaptist part of the so-called Evangelical Christianity of the present day is not able to hold its ground steadily, at this point, against the Baptist wing of the same interest. The Baptist sentiment grows and spreads in every direction. It infects more and more, the secret thinking even of those sects which

still retain, in a traditional way, the old practice. The question of infant baptism is sunk in many quarters, as by general consent, into the category of *adiaphora*—things indifferent; as though it lay wholly on the outside of the proper sense and true actual substance of the Christian life. Some of our evangelical sects, it is easy to see, could at once part with the usage altogether, and not miss it in their scheme of practical religion. Hence, as a general thing, it appears to have fallen into very alarming neglect. Some of our more respectable denominations, or rather some thoughtful persons in these denominations, have in fact begun to take alarm from this cause, and are showing a disposition to lift the whole doctrine of Christian Baptism again, if possible, into a higher sphere, such as may correspond, in part at least, with the sacramental worth assigned to it in past ages. This, as far as it goes, is matter for congratulation. But it remains to be seen, how far any such reactionary feeling shall be able to stay and turn the tide, which still threatens to sweep all before it in the opposite direction. And who can say, what perils, not merely for the doctrine of Christian Baptism, but for the whole idea of the Christian Sacraments, for the very being of the Church, and in the end for the universal interest of Christianity itself, may not be involved in the full triumph of what claims to be the perfection of religion in such spiritualistic form!

What we mean by all this, is simply to show that the problem of settling the difference between the old doctrine of Christian Baptism and the view which has taken the place of it so widely in modern times—a difference which involves in the end two different schemes of Christianity,—is not just to be disposed of satisfactorily by the simple assumption, that the difficulty of the question lies wholly on the one side, the doctrine namely of the ancient Church, and not at all on the other. There are real difficulties of the most embarrassing kind on both sides; and it must ever be an argument of the most superficial thinking, not to perceive them, or not to acknowledge their force.

Lancaster, Pa.

J. W. N.

ART. III.—THE ENGLISH LANGUAGE.

It is our purpose in the present article to give an account of the rise and progress of the English Language, and its present position, and close by a glance at what may be its destiny.

Language is the gift of God to man. The use of it is to be regarded as one of those peculiar powers which exalt man above the lower orders of creation, and ally him to the higher intelligences. The theory of Horace,—that man at first existed in a state of barbarism, isolated from his fellows, and only by slow degrees, under the stimulus of his social instincts, found out words and names by which to express his sensations and thoughts*—may serve for a heathen philosopher, but is not worthy of consideration by those who believe in God, and accept the Bible as a revelation from Him. Man was created in the possession of language so as to be able to express feeling and thought; for without language, thought, or continuous reflection, is impossible.

Languages, like the nations that speak them, may have a youth, and slowly grow to maturity, and may then exhibit a decline and old age, and finally may die out altogether as vehicles of speech or thought among men; but this is due to the circumstances under which they are developed, or to the character or fortune of those who speak them. Moreover, any theory built up from an inspection of derived tongues, or their peculiar history, will necessarily fail when we come to the consideration of language

* Quum proreperunt primis animalia terris
Mutum et turpe pecus, glandem atque cubilla propter
Unguibus et pugnâ, dein fustibus, atque ita porro
Pugnabant armis, quæ post fabricaverat usus,
Donec verba, quibus voces sensusque notarent,
Nominaque invenere.—Sat. III. 99-104.

in its origin. Neither may we conclude that the growth of a language involves any addition to its grammatical forms. The progress is rather an expansion of its original life, which molds, governs and vivifies every phase of its development according to general laws, under the control of God only.

The English is one of the youngest in the family of spoken languages; and it exhibits in its history a progress from weakness to strength, from paucity and roughness to copiousness and refinement. The steps in its progress are so evident that its history is on this account worthy of our attention.

The history of the English language is of course intimately connected with the history of the English people. It begins, properly, at that point in English history, when, at the invitation of the Britons, A. D. 449, the Saxon chiefs, Hengist and Horsa entered the Island. The Saxons, having driven back the Picts and Scots, conquered also the Britons, whom they came to defend, and subdued them so thoroughly, that but little trace of their language, which was of Celtic origin, remained; the Anglo Saxon, the language of the conquerors, taking its place.

The Anglo Saxon is one of the dialects of the ancient Gothic, which prevailed over all the countries of Europe denominated as barbarous by the Greeks and Romans, except those in which the Celtic, or Sclavonian, were spoken. The three immediate descendants of the Gothic were the Anglo Saxon, the Franco-Theotisc, and the old Icelandic. Of the Gothic itself but a single monument remains, an imperfect copy of the Gospels, preserved in the library, at Upsala, in Sweden. From the silver with which its characters are adorned, it has long been called the *Codex Argenteus*.

The precise form of the Saxon when Hengist and Horsa entered Britain, it is impossible to discover. The Saxons were evidently, at that time, a people without learning, and there is every probability that they were even without an alphabet.

From the period of the subjugation of the Britons by the Saxons, the language suffered no remarkable change during a period of several hundred years. From the remains of it that have come down to modern times, it seems to have been capable of meeting all the necessities of the people; but this is saying very little, for, at the time of the Norman conquest, there is reason to believe that literature was in a very low condition. A cotemporary writer, a native of England, describes his countrymen generally as having been found by the Normans, in the eleventh century, a rustic and illiterate people. No names eminent for learning are recorded in this age of the Saxon Church.

At the battle of Hasting, in 1066, William of Normandy conquered the Saxons on their own soil; and following up his success, in the course of six or seven years, he subdued the whole Island. But he did not subdue the language; nor do we believe that he attempted to, though a tradition runs to that effect. The use of the Norman-French, as the language of the court and the higher classes generally, was a matter of course. Some of its words, indeed, soon found their way into the language of the common people, but they did not materially modify it.

A gradual, but considerable, change did take place in the Anglo Saxon during the eleventh and twelfth centuries. It then began to take on a form in which we may discover the beginning of the present English. "But that these mutations," says a late writer, "were a consequence of the Norman invasion, or were even accelerated by that event, is wholly incapable of proof; and nothing rests upon a firmer principle of induction than that the same effects would have ensued, if William and his followers had remained upon their native soil." The substance of the changes consists in the suppression of those grammatical intricacies occasioned by the inflection of nouns, the arbitrary distinctions of gender, the government of prepositions, &c. How far this may be considered as the result of an innate law of the language, or some general law in the organization of those who spoke it, we may leave un-

determined ; but that it was in no way dependent on external circumstances, upon foreign influence or political disturbances, is established by this undeniable fact—that every branch of the Low German stock, whence the Anglo Saxon sprang, displays the same simplification of its grammar. In all these languages there has been a constant tendency to relieve themselves of that precision which chooses a fresh symbol for every shade of meaning to lessen the amount of nice distinctions, and detect as it were a royal road to the interchange of thought.*

This change may be regarded as the first step in the passage of the Anglo Saxon into the modern English ; the next was the change made in the vocabulary of the language by the introduction of numerous terms borrowed from the French. Of this latter innovation, however, we find little trace till long after the completion of the former. For nearly two hundred years after the conquest, the Saxon seems to have been spoken and written with scarcely any intermixture of Norman. It only, in fact, began to receive such adulteration after it came to be adopted as the speech of that part of the nation which had previously spoken French. And this adoption by those of Norman descent was plainly the cause, and the sole cause, of the intermixture. The corruption of the Saxon by the intermingling of French vocables must have proceeded from those whose original language was French, and who were familiar with French customs and literature, at the same time that they spoke Saxon. And this supposition is in perfect accordance with the historical fact. So long as the Saxon was the language of only a part of the people, and the French struggled with it for the mastery, it remained comparatively pure ; when it became the speech of the whole people, the higher classes as well as the lower, it lost its old Teutonic purity, and received a large alien admixture from the alien lips through which it passed. For the subsequent changes of this character and the continued

* Warton's *Hist. Eng. Poetry*, p. 110.

introduction of large numbers of new words from the French and the Latin, numerous reasons will suggest themselves ; such as the Latin service in the churches, its use as a common language among the learned, the French dominions attached to the English crown, and the consequent intercourse either in commerce or war between the two nations. Besides in this middle period, though the Norman settlers had become amalgamated with the people, genteel education was still considered incomplete without French. "Also gentilmens children," says Trevisa, "ben lerned and taught from their yongth to speke Frenssh, and up londissh men will counterfete and likene hem selfe to gentilmen, and arn bésy to speke Frenssh for to be more sette by. Wherefore it is said by a common proverb, Jack would be a gentilman if he coude speke Frenssh."* Whether this were a fortunate circumstance or otherwise, we will not now discuss.

The pestilence of 1349 forms a remarkable era in the history of the language ; before that time, as we have remarked, the nobility and gentry affected to converse in French, "but from the time of the first moreyn this maner was somdel ychaungide." This marks the point when the language began to digest its various elements into "English," and to take on that form which it retains to the present day. It is worthy of note that Edward III ordered the pleadings in the courts to "be carried on in English" in 1362.

The translation of the Scriptures into the vernacular by Wickliffe, was the most important literary work of this period, as it had an immense influence upon the subsequent history of the language. It was finished in the year 1382. We select as a specimen a few verses from the last chapter of Luke:—

But in o day of the woke ful eerli thei camen to the grave,
and broughten swete smelling spices that thei hadden arayed.
And thei founden the stoon turayd away fro the grave. And
thei geden in and founden not the bodi of the Lord Jhesus.

*Pict. Hist. England, Vol. II, pp. 211.

And it was don the while thei weren astonyed in thought of this thing, lo twey men stoden bisidis hem in schynynge cloth. And whanne thei dredden and bowiden her semblaunt into orthe, thei seiden to hem, what seeken ye him that lyueth with deede men?

The most eminent literary names of this period are Gower and Chaucer. The latter being justly regarded as the father of English literature, in a much higher sense than merely standing at its head, as our language owes the foundation of its enduring constitution principally to him. From Gower's *Confessio Amantis* we give a short extract:—

In a Cronig I fynde thus,
How that Caius Fabricius
Wich whilome was consul of Rome,
By whome the lawes yede and come,
Whan the Samppitees to him brouht
A somme of golde, and hym by souht
To done hem favoure in the lawe,
Towarde the golde he gan hym drawe :
Wherof, in alles menne loke,
A part in to his honde he tooke,
Wich to his mouthe in alle haste
He put hit for to smelle and taste,
And to his ihe and to his ere,
Bot he ne fonde no comfort there :
And thanne he be gan hit to despise,
And tolde vnto hem in this wise :
“I not what is with golde to thryve
When none of alle my wittes fyve
Fynt savour ne delite ther inne.”

The reader may judge of Chaucer's prose from the following extract from the *Canterbury Tales* :—

Now as to the outrageous array of women, God wote that though the visages of som of hem semen ful chaste and debonaire, yet notifen they in hir array of attire likerounesse and pride. I say not that honestee in clothing of man or woman is unconvenable, but certes the superfluitee or disordinat scarcitee of clothing is reprevable. Also the sinne

of ornement or of apparaile is in thinges that appertaine to riding, as in to many delicat hors that ben holden for delit, that ben so faire, fatte, and costlewe; and also in many a vicious knave that is susteined because of hem; in curious harness, as in sadler, croppers, peitrels, and bridles covered with precious cloth and rich, barred and plated of gold and of silver; for which God sayth by Zacharie the prophet, I wol confounde the riders of swiche hors.

The art of printing, though it had been practised in Germany for nearly thirty years, at length was introduced into England, about 1470, by William Caxton. The introduction of this "art preservative of all arts," had a great effect in advancing the literature and fixing the form of the language. Our specimen of the English of this age is from a book translated from the French by Caxton himself, and printed in 1488.

I wold ye knewe wel the tale and example of the lady which daygned not to come to her dyner for ony commaundement that her lord coud make to her, and so many tyme he sent for her that at the last whanne he sawe she wold not come at his commaundement he made to com be fore hym his swyneherd, he that kept his swynes, whiche was foule and ouermoché hydous, and bad hym fetché the clowte of the kechyn wherewith men wype dysshes and platers. And thenne he made a table or bord to be dressyd be fore hys wyf and made it to be couerd with the sayde cloute. . . . And whenne she that thenne was sore ashamed and more wrothe than she was tofore, sawe and knewe that her lord mocked her, refreyned her proude herte and knewe her foly. Therfor a woman ought not in no wyse to refuse to come at the commaundement of her lord, yf she wyлле have and kepe his loue and pees.

The English language in the course of the sixteenth century, as regards both its vocabulary and its syntax, reached very nearly the state in which it still exists; and which may, therefore, be assumed to be the full and final development of its formative genius and tendencies.

The letter, which Sir Thomas More wrote to his wife in 1528, after the burning of his house in Chelsea, affords a good specimen of epistolary English at this period:—

Maistres Alyce, in my most harty wise, I recommend me to you; and whereas I am enfourmed by my son Heron of the losse of our barnes and of our neighbors also, with all the corn that was therein, albeit (saving God's pleasure) it is gret pitie of so much good corne lost, yet sith it hath liked hym to sende us such a chaunce, we must and are bounden, not only to be content, but also to be glad of his visitacion. He sente us all that we have loste; and sith he hath by such a chaunce taken it away againe, his pleasure be fulfilled. Let us never grudge ther at, but take it in good worth, and hartely thank him, as well for adversitie as for prosperitie. And peradventure we have more cause to thank him for our losse, then for our winning; for his wisdom better seeth what is good for vs than we do our selves. Therfor I pray you be of good chere, and take all the howsold with you to church, and there thanke God, both for that he hath given us, and for that he hath taken from us, and for that he hath left us, which if it please hym he can encrease when he will. And if it please hym to leave us yet lesse, at his pleasure be it. . . .

The following is an extract from Latimer's third sermon before Edward VI. 1549:—

For it is *consolatio miserorum*, it is the comfort of the wretched to have companye. When I was in trouble, it was objected and sayed unto me that I was syngular, that no man thought as I thought, that I love a syngularyte in all that I dyd, and that I tooke a way, contrarye to the kyng and the whole parliamente, and that I was travayled wyth them that had better wyttes than I, that I was contrary to them al. Marye syr thys was a sore thunder bolte. I thought it an yrkesome thyng to be a lone, and to have no fellows. I thoughte it was possyble it myghte not be true that they tolde me. In the vii. of John the Priestres sente out certayne of the Jewes to bring Chryst unto them vyolentlye. When they came into the Temple and harde hym preache, they were so moved wyth his preaching that they returned home agayne, and sayed to them that sente them, *Nunquam sic locutus est homo ut hic homo*, there was never man spake lyke thys man.

Our last example is from "Wilson's Arte of Rhetorique," published in 1553. The following describes

By what means Eloquence is obtained.

First, nedefull it is that he which desireth to excell in this

gift of Oratorie, and longeth to prove an eloquent man, must naturally have a wit and aptnesse thereunto: then must he to his booke, and learne to be well stored with knowledge, that he maie be able to minister matter for all causes neecessarie. The which when he hath gotte plentifully, he must use muche exercise, bothe in writyng and also in speakyng. For though he have a wit and learnyng together, yet shall thei bothe litle availle without muche practise. What maketh the Lawyer to have such utterance? Practise. What maketh the Preacher to speake so roundly? Practise. Yea, what maketh women go so fast awai with their wordes? Marie, Practise, I warraunt you.

Edmund Spenser was born in 1553, and published the earlier portion of his great poem in 1590. William Shakspeare, born in 1564, appeared in print as early as 1593. Each of these great masters of the English tongue can be read with ease by any well-educated person at home in the English of the present day. So little has the language changed in almost three centuries.

The present authorized version of the Scriptures was first published in 1613. Considered merely in a literary point of view, it is a most remarkable production, honorable to the translators and to the character of the language at that period of its history. The subjects of this volume are "vast as eternity, sublime as the throne of God;" its variety is almost without limit; and although it was designed to be a literal translation of the original Hebrew and Greek, it must have been no common language which could have preserved the precision, force and beauty of the originals it so strikingly displays. It is, indeed, an English classic, where many an orator has kindled the fire of his eloquence and many a poet has gained that strength of wing by which he has soared to

"——the highest heaven of invention."

"One of the chiefest among the minor and secondary blessings which that Version has conferred on the nation or nations drawing spiritual life from it,—a blessing not small in itself, but only small by comparison with the in-

initely higher blessings whereof it is the vehicle to them, —is the happy wisdom, the instinctive tact with which its authors have steered between any futile mischievous attempt to ignore the full rights of the Latin part of the language on the one side, and on the other any burdening of their Version with such a multitude of learned Latin terms as should cause it to forfeit its homely character, and shut up great portions of it from the understanding of plain and unlearned men. There is a remarkable confession to this effect, to the wisdom, in fact, which guided them from above, to the providence that overruled their work, an honorable acknowledgment of the immense superiority in this respect of our English Version over the Romish or Douay, made by one now unhappily familiar with the latter, as once he was with our own. These are his words: "Who will not say that the uncommon beauty and marvellous English of the Protestant Bible is not one of the great strongholds of heresy in this country? It lives on the ear like a music that can never be forgotten, like the sounds of church bells, which the convert hardly knows how he can forego. Its felicities often seem to be almost things rather than mere words. It is part of the national mind; and the anchor of national seriousness. The memory of the dead passes into it. The potent traditions of childhood are stereotyped in its verses. The power of all the griefs and trials of a man is hidden beneath its words. It is the representative of his best moments, and all that there has been about him of soft and gentle, and pure and penitent and good, speaks to him forever out of his English Bible. It is his sacred thing, which doubt has never dimmed, and controversy never soiled. In the length and breadth of the land there is not a Protestant with one spark of religiousness about him, whose spiritual biography is not in his Saxon Bible."*

The period we have now reached in the history of the language marks the commencement of that wonderful literary activity which carried the English tongue to the high-

* Trench's *English past and present*, pp. 34, 35.

est degree of excellence ; we can, of course, merely allude to that mighty galaxy of intellectual stars, which during the 17th and 18th centuries made the language the vehicle of light and pleasure for the whole world.

In 1755 Dr. Samuel Johnson earned the gratitude of every lover of the language by the publication of his "Complete English Dictionary," which furnished what had long been greatly needed, an authoritative standard, drawn from the usage of the best writers ; for reputable custom is that use, which Horace long since considered the fountain of authority in language.

"—usus,

Quem penes arbitrium est et jus et norma loquendi."

The grammatical structure of the English is more simple than that of any other language, if we except the Hebrew, without the points ; and the facility with which its grammatical construction may be acquired, is not the least of its advantages. The *article* has no variation. The *adjective* is only varied to express the degrees of comparison. With regard to the *noun*, grammatical gender, with one or two fragmentary exceptions, is altogether foregone. The *verb* has but one conjugation ; and the original verb remains mostly unchanged in all its moods and tenses. He, who, with great labor, has mastered the various inflections of the Latin, Greek and French verbs, will know how to estimate this advantage. The order of the words in the construction of sentences is the order of nature ; nor does the idiom of the language allow extensively of inversion, except in poetry. This gives it a logical and philosophical character. The language is also wonderfully copious, and it is growing in this respect continually. This arises :—1st. From its obtaining its words from many sources ; the Saxon readily admitted new words, and it has borrowed from the Arabic, Hebrew, Greek, Latin, Gaelic, Danish, and all the languages of modern Europe.—2nd. From its facility of compounding words ; although it is inferior in this respect to the German.—3rd. From the possession of a large class of words purely poetic ; in which respect it is the equal of the German, and immeasurably superior to the French.

Variety and flexibility are secured by dispensing with the uniform terminology of the ancient tongues, and richness is gained by adopting from all sources whatever the necessities of the millions who read and speak it demand.

The English language, while it has neither the *esprit* of the French, nor the *gemüthlichkeit* of the German, is superior to either in the untold wealth of its noble literature. Far superior, indeed, in this respect to any other language ever written or spoken in the world.

Although no tongue, probably, will ever be a language for the world, nor are we sure that this is desirable, yet the English has certainly the best prospect for becoming nearly so. Upon the Empire of Britain the sun never sets; and her language is a familiar sound in every quarter of the globe. It is the common speech of the two most powerful, enterprising, commercial nations known to history. British and American commerce cannot fail to carry it, as on the wings of the wind, to the utmost ends of the earth. These nations also are more influenced by the missionary spirit of the Gospel of Christ than any other; and the heralds they are sending forth to the benighted and waste places of the earth appear to be destined in the providence of God to be the principle instruments in diffusing Christianity throughout the world. The introduction of their language accompanies this mighty work almost as a matter of course. Who then can say when the triumphs of the English tongue shall cease? Who can limit its power to direct and control the interests of the human race?

ART. IV.—GERMAN HYMNOLOGY.

The following article, translated from the German of Dr. Philip Schaff, was published in the *Deutsche Kirchenfreund* of December last, and intended as an introduction for the new *Gesangbuch* by the same author.* Of late years the interest in hymnology has been steadily growing among the English Churches of America, and many will no doubt be glad to learn what our German brethren have done, and are now doing, in this important field. A like fate has befallen the treasures of sacred song in both languages, although the English have not suffered to as great an extent as the German. Yet they too have been sadly curtailed and mutilated by rude, unskillful hands, and, worse than all, forced to give up the utterances of faith and devotion, and in too many cases receive, instead, the bald, prosaic substitutions of a rationalistic age. A revival and restoration of the old, pure unaltered originals (few classic hymns have become antiquated in our tongue) is loudly called for, and he will perform a truly good work, who takes the pains to collect, compile and publish a complete *thesaurus* of English hymns, as given to the world by the poets who wrote them. This would form a solid basis for all future hymn-books and relieve coming generations from endless confusion.

The *Gesangbuch* of Dr. Schaff is a model of its kind. Its order is clear, simple, artistic, churchly; its selection of hymns, made in accordance with sound taste and fervid piety, embraces the finest productions of the Christian Muse of all ages; its critical, historical and biographical annotations are of great value, especially to the English scholar, and its style of publication corresponds in every respect with the demands of the age and the excellent character of its contents.

THE TRANSLATOR.

"O sing unto the Lord a new song: sing unto the Lord, all the earth. Sing unto the Lord, bless his name; show

* *Deutsches Gesangbuch*. Eine Auswahl geistlicher Lieder aus allen Zeiten der Christlichen Kirche. Nach den besten hymnologischen Quellen bearbeitet und mit erläuternden Bemerkungen über die Verfasser, der Inhalt, und die Geschichte der Lieder versehen, von Philipp Schaff, Prof. und Dr. der Theol. Philadelphia. 1859.

forth his salvation from day to day. Declare his glory among the heathen, his wonders among all people." Such was the appeal made by the sweet singer of Israel, in the 96th Psalm, to the church of the Old Testament. "Be filled with the Spirit; speaking to yourselves in psalms and hymns and spiritual songs, singing and making melody in your heart to the Lord; giving thanks always for all things unto God and the Father in the name of our Lord Jesus Christ." Thus the apostle of the New Testament exhorted "the saints and faithful brethren" at Ephesus and Colosse.

Here we find that God himself has consecrated the two noblest of the fine arts to his service, and assigned them an enduring place of honor in the worship of his sanctuary. Christianity, which entered the world amid the anthem of the heavenly host: "Glory to God in the highest, and on earth peace, good will toward men," contains an inexhaustible store of the richest material for the fairest and grandest creations of poetry and music, suited to the tongues both of men and of angels.

Among the various kinds of religious poetry, the hymn exerts by far the greatest influence upon the Christian life in the church, the school and the family. Lyrical in its structure, it differs from other forms of lyrical poetry, as the ode, the elegy and the sonnet, in its religious contents and the ease with which it may be understood and sung. What the popular song (*volks-lied*) is to the nation that the hymn is to the Church. It embodies the profound and living ideas of Holy Writ in plain, pure, melodious language, and, representing in its own subjective experience the experience of all Christendom, is equally at home in the house of God and in the exercises of private devotion. The most sacred kind of poetry and glorified by its use in worship, it rises as a sweet-smelling sacrifice from the earthly altar to the throne of God. It is the highest flower of the Christian life, arrayed in a festal garb of beauty.

The church-hymn is one of the most powerful means for promoting the *unity* of the faith and the *communion* of

saints. In the general chorus the voice of the individual is lost, only to be borne up heavenward on the wings of the common devotion. Genuine spiritual songs contain nothing dogmatically exclusive, are not denominational or sectarian in the bad sense of the word, but truly Christian and catholic, a popular expression of the simplest and deepest religious feelings of the heart. What a Luther or Paul Gerhardt, a Joachim Neander or Tersteegen have produced, can be sung and prayed by Reformed and Lutheran congregations with equal fervor. When such hymns as "Ein feste Burg ist unser Gott," "O Haupt voll Blut und Wunden," "Nun danket Alle Gott," "Lobe den Herrn, den mächtigen König der Ehren," "Gott ist gegenwärtig" are sung, the Evangelical Church forgets all her internal strifes and party interests and feels herself to be one heart and one soul. Even the strong antagonism between the Catholic and the Protestant is drowned amid the harmonies of the "Gloria in excelsis" and the "Te Deum." In this respect the hymns of the Christian Church are like the psalms—the common property of all. They find an echo in all pious hearts, and possess an imperishable power and freshness, like the sun in his daily rising and the spring in its annual return. Instead of being worn out by age and use, their influence is extended and deepened every year and every century. They resemble those healing herbs, which the more they are rubbed give out richer odors. The 23rd, 51st, and 103rd psalms of David, the hymn of the Virgin Mary, and the Te Deum of the ancient Church can not be read and sung to-day, without bringing home to us the communion of numberless saints, whom they have edified in past ages and who from the heights of heaven sympathize in the worship of the militant Church as she sings and prays on earth.

Not only does the hymn serve to enkindle the fires of devotion in the sanctuary, but it also accompanies the individual members of the congregation, in the domestic circle and the quiet chamber, as a protecting and comforting angel, in their pilgrimage from the cradle to the grave. It

awakens them from the sleep of sin, strengthens them in the faith, fills them with holy emotions, inspires them to divine thoughts and deeds, arms them for conflict and victory against all enemies, hallows their joys, sweetens their sorrows, encourages them to patience and resignation and comforts them in the last hour with a foretaste of the perfect worship of Heaven, where the innumerable host of the redeemed, of all ages, lands and tongues, together with angels and archangels, never grow weary of extolling, as with one mouth and heart and in ever new ways, the wonderful works of almighty wisdom and love in the realms of nature and grace.

Thus psalms and spiritual songs continue from generation to generation the true benefactors of struggling and suffering humanity, ministering angels "sent forth to minister for them who shall be heirs of salvation." The history of their blessed influence may be traced in the biographies of the most pious and enlightened Christians, but will only fully appear on that day when all that is hidden shall be revealed. If Scaliger, the celebrated scholar, declared that he would rather be the author of a certain ode of Horace than king of Aragon, the pious Gellert said, with still better reason, that he would rather have composed a few of the old classic church-hymns than all the odes of Pindar and Horace, and added, that if by his own he could contribute in any measure to the edification of God's people it would give him more joy than to possess "the fame of the greatest epic poet and the most eloquent philosopher of all nations."*

Hence, next to the Sacred Scriptures, at least for the German nation, with its love of poetry and music, no religious aid is more indispensable in church, school and family than a book of hymns, which are not only heard and read, but also prayed and sung, which live not only in the mouths, but in the hearts of the people and carry their awakening, sanctifying and consoling power into the daily affairs of life.

* Preface to his *Geistlichen Oden und Liedern*. Leipzig. 1757.

The *history* of hymnology is one of the most interesting branches of church-history, and equally important for the development of Christian life and Christian worship (cultus). It is like a garden filled with fragrant flowers that bloom in unfading beauty. It shows us piety in its purest forms, severest conflicts, most precious experiences, most blessed enjoyments, and in its essential unity, despite all the variations of language and race. The tears of penitence, the joys of faith, the glow of love, the consolations of hope, the strength of patience are the same in all ages and here assemble round the altar of devotion as an offering of praise and thanksgiving to the Triune God, who has created, redeemed and sanctified us and is alone worthy to receive honor, glory and adoration from everlasting to everlasting.

The *Psalms* of the *Old Testament* form the most ancient book of church-poetry extant. The religious lyric poetry of the Hebrews reached its highest point in the age of David and Solomon and lent to the temple-service an extraordinary solemnity. The royal psalmist, from whom the whole collection takes its name, appointed no fewer than four thousand singers, arranged in twenty four courses, under two hundred and eighty-eight leaders (1 Chron. 16: 6, and ch. 25). Accompanied by the music of trumpets, cymbals, harps and other instruments they sang the psalms whilst the people chimed in responsively or sang after them. Stamped with the seal of divine authority and confirmed by the example of the Saviour at the institution of the Holy Supper, (Matth. 26, 30.) these psalms are used to this day in all lands and confessions of Christendom, partly in the form of literal translations, and partly in the form of metrical reproductions, in which the language of the New Testament is often substituted for that of the Old. In versions of this kind the English Church is particularly rich.

Next to the *Psalms*, we find, on the threshold of the New Dispensation, the glorious hymns of the Virgin Mary (the so-called Magnificat, Luke 1: 46 ff.), of Zacharias (the

Benedictus, 1 : 68 ff.), of the heavenly host (the Gloria, 2 : 14), of Simeon (2 : 29), and those songs of the early church, of which at least traces and hints exist in the apostolic writings*). But the New Testament contains everywhere the most fruitful germs of poetry and many of the finest church-hymns are merely variations of single words of Christ and the Apostles.

The *Greek Church* was the first to inaugurate church-hymnology as distinguished from that which is purely biblical or divine. Her first attempts were doxologies, or, at most, ascriptions of praise to God or Christ, compiled from passages of the Bible. The heathen governor, Pliny, testifies, in the beginning of the second century, that the Christians in their assemblies were accustomed to sing hymns to Christ as their God, and Eusebius, the church-historian, speaks, in the beginning of the fourth, of many Christian psalms and odes, which glorify Christ as the divine Word (Logos). To the ancient Greek Church we are indebted for two grand, psalm-like anthems, the "Gloria in excelsis," which arose from the song of the angels in Luke 2 : 14, and the "Te Deum," which was afterwards translated into Latin and enlarged by Ambrose. Almost contemporaneous with the Greek hymnology stands that of the *Syrian Church*, in which the deacon, Ephraim of Edessa (†378) plays the chief part. Its influence, however, was confined to the land of its birth.

With the fourth century begins the history of the *Latin* hymnology, among whose poets the names of Ambrose (†367), Hilary (†368), Prudentius (†405), Augustine (†430), Fortunatus (†600), Notker (†912), Bernard of Clairvaux (†1153), Thomas von Celano († about 1250), Bonaventura (†1274), Thomas Aquinas (†1274), and Jacobus de Benedictis (†1306) occupy the most prominent place.

The ancient Latin and mediæval Church produced many immortal hymns and sequences, full of majesty, dignity

* See Acts 4 : 24-30. Eph. 5 : 14, 19. Col. 3 : 16. 1 Tim. 3 : 16. 2 Tim. 2 : 11. James 1 : 17. Rev. 1 : 4-8, 5 : 6-14, 11 : 16-19, 16 : 6-7, 21 : 1-8, 22 : 10-17, 20.

and power, which served as models to the oldest evangelical writers. Thus more than half of Luther's six and thirty hymns are free translations and poetical paraphrases of psalms and Latin originals†; Gerhard's touching passion-hymn: "O Haupt, voll Blut und Wunden," is based on St. Bernard's "Salve caput cruentatum," and several of the finest judgment-hymns, both in German and English, are for the most part echoes of the terrible "Dies irae," which will no doubt retain its power to shake the human soul, until the last day, the day of wrath itself, shall come. The Evangelical Church has not broken with history in a radical manner, but here also, as in retaining the oecumenical creeds, holds firmly to her connection with all that is true and good in the Christianity of past ages.

And yet the *Evangelical Protestant Church* has far surpassed both the Greek and the Latin in the variety and number of her hymnological creations. The Reformation had the peculiar honor of giving birth to the genuine popular church-hymn in the vernacular tongue, as well as singing by the whole congregation. This stood in bold contrast with the mediæval practice, in which the priest and choir alone sang, and that in the Latin language, an unknown tongue to the majority of the people. The doctrine of the universal priesthood of believers came thus to be recognized in the family and in the public worship of the sanctuary. Among the different Protestant Churches, that of Germany, beyond all question, holds the first rank in the history of hymnology. Her treasures of this kind are by far the richest, and furnish a brilliant proof of the poetic and religious endowments of the German nation and the inward power of her evangelical faith. German hymnology, if we except a few imperfect beginnings in the middle ages, started into life with the Reformation, and accom-

† Twelve are translations of old catholic hymns, of which ten had been translated into German before; seven are versions of Latin psalms; four, improvements of older German originals; eight, elaborations of particular passages of the Bible, and five, altogether from his own pen. See the modern works of *Crusius*, *Paris*, *Ph. Wackernagel* and *Schircks* on "Luther's geistliche Lieder," and *E. E. Koch's* "Geschichte des Kirchenlieds und Kirchengesangs" (V. I. p. 80 f. of the 2d ed. of 1852).

panied it as a herald in its swift and victorious career through German lands, whilst the Protestant Churches of Switzerland, France, Holland and England, for a long time after, contented themselves with metrical versions of the Psalms. The first German evangelical hymn-book, the so-called Wittenberg Enchiridion, appeared in the year 1523 and contained eight hymns (four by Luther, three by Speratus and one by an unknown author); the Erfurt Enchiridion of 1524 could boast already of twenty five (of which eighteen were from Luther); the hymn-book of Walter, of the same year, numbered thirty-two; Klug's of 1529 had fifty-four; Babst's of 1545, eighty-nine, and the second edition, of 1568, as many as four hundred hymns. Since then the German hymnology has received accessions with the lapse of almost every decade, and now counts, as the result of three hundred years' activity, about eighty thousand spiritual songs.* Of these at least several hundred are classical, and, as far as the German language extends, have come into general use, whilst the fifteen centuries before the Reformation can scarcely show one thousand hymns in all, of which only about one hundred and fifty, at most, have attained a living power in the Church, or, more properly, among the clergy.

To this treasury of German song, several hundred men and women of all ranks and conditions,—theologians and pastors, princes and princesses, generals and statesmen, physicians and jurists, merchants and travellers, laborers and private persons—have made contributions, laying them on the common altar of devotion. Many of these hymns, and just those possessed of the greatest vigor and unction, full of the most exulting faith and the richest comfort, had their origin amid the conflicts and storms of the Reformation, or the fearful devastations and nameless misery of the Thirty Years' War; others belong to the revival-period of Spenerian Pietism and the Moravian Brotherhood, and re-

* The *Leiderlexicon* of C. L. v. Hardenberg (5 vol.), in the public library at Halberstadt, stops with the year 1786, yet contains 72,782 hymns with an index of the first lines.

flect its earnest struggle after holiness, the fire of first love and the sweet enjoyment of the soul's intercourse with her Heavenly Bridegroom; not a few of them sprang up even in the unbelieving age of "illumination" and rationalism, like flowers from dry ground, or alpine roses on fields of snow; others, again, proclaim, in fresh and joyous tones, the dawn of reviving faith in the land where the Reformation had its birth. Thus these hymns constitute a most graphic book of confession for German evangelical Christianity, a sacred band which encircles its various periods, an abiding memorial of its victories, its sorrows and its joys, a clear mirror showing its deepest experiences, and an eloquent witness for the all-conquering and invincible life-power of the evangelical Christian faith.

The period of decay in the Protestant Church of Germany, which began about the middle of the last century and continued far into the present, laid, alas! its thankless and profane hands upon the treasures of sacred song and buried them under heaps of rubbish for several generations. And yet, during this very time German poetry and music were soaring in their highest flights; but the greatest poets and musical composers—we need only name Goethe and Schiller, Mozart and Beethoven—felt themselves repelled from a cold and degenerate Church and devoted their brilliant powers almost exclusively to profane art, which may, however, be regarded as the forerunner of a new age of religious art.

The beginning of this unfortunate *hymnological revolution* was made with well-meaning zeal and without any presentiment of its mischievous consequences, by gifted poets and worthy men like Klopstock, who, in the year 1758, along with his own spiritual odes, published twenty-nine of the old hymns in an altered form. Soon after appeared modernized hymn-books by Andreas Cramer, John Adolph Schlegel, John Samuel Diterich, and G. Joachim Zollikofer. The aim of these men was not so much to injure the doctrinal contents as to soften down the frequent rude phrases of the old hymns, in order to make them run more

smoothly to suit the taste of the age, but they knew not how to value their venerable quaintness and genial simplicity and very often by new modes of expression weakened the power of the thought. Thus, for example, Schlegel (1765) ventured even to convert Luther's "Ein' feste Burg," because of the wholly innocent and admissible elision in the article, into "Ein starker Schutz," and the lines of Hermann:

"Fällt mir etwas Arges ein,
Denk ich gleich an Deine Pein,
Die erlaubet meinem Herzen
Mit der Sünde nicht zu scherzen."

merely on account of the unusual position of the negative, into:

"Mich sollt' ich durch Sünd' entweih'n ?
Nein, ich denk, an Deine Pein
Ach, den ganzen Gräu'l der Sünden
Lässt mich die mit Gräu'n empfinden."

—a change for the worse, viewed simply from an aesthetic stand-point. Diterich acted with still more freedom and caprice, since, in his hymn-book of 1765, which was first brought out as an appendix to that of Porst in Berlin, he altered and re-wrought in part not only the older hymns, but also those selected from the writings of Gellert.

After him came a whole swarm of officious hymnological tinkers, whose very names are now almost forgotten, neological counsellors of the consistory, court-preachers, general superintendents and poetasters, utterly devoid of sympathy with the spirit of the old hymns, as well as of poetic sense and taste. In their hands, under the growing influence of rationalism, the desire for reform, at first well-meant and in some respects not altogether unjustifiable, degenerated more and more into an Erostratic mania for mutilating, weakening and diluting, which sometimes approached the borders of profanity. The glorious classic productions of an age of faith were wantonly deprived of their specifically Christian contents and poetic beauty, so as scarcely to be recognized, or cast overboard as antiquated and offensive, in order to make room for the tedious rhymings of a pró-

saic religion of reason and virtue, or a sickly and mawkish sentimentalism. Penitence was now converted into improvement, sanctification into self-ennoblement, piety into virtue, faith into religion, eternal life into the better world and the joys of reunion; yea, the living Christ himself had to make room for Christianity in the abstract, and the personal God, for the Deity, Providence or even Fate. Instead of hymns of faith and salvation, the congregations were obliged, from that time forward, to sing "moral sermons in rhyme" upon the proofs for the existence of God and immortality, upon all possible virtues and duties, upon the glorious endowments and dignity of man, upon the five senses, upon "the flourishing condition of the sciences, trade, navigation and manufactures," upon the nurture of the body, upon the care of animals and trees, and even upon the cow-pox.*

Along with this deterioration in books of hymns a similar *revolution in books of church-music* went hand in hand. "Hymn and choral"—says an accomplished connoisseur of evangelical church-music†—"sermon and prayer, shared a like fate—a rapid falling away from plain, free, direct expression, humble, inward, hearty, strong, enthusiastic faith, depth of spirit, and adaptation to the wants of the people, into the empty void of abstract, reflexive subjec-

* Numerous and striking proofs of the correctness of this picture may be found in several hymnological essays from C. v. Raumer and Bunsen in the *Evangelische Kirchenzeitung* of 1829 and 1830, especially in Nos. 32 and 33; also, in the well-known writings of Stier and Kraz on the "*Gesangbuchsnoth*." Yet even in its first beginnings the mischief stirred up righteous indignation. The genial poet, Schubart (†1791), who was awakened to serious reflection upon the folly of his previous life, in the fortress of Hohenasperg, used this language: "Wo to us, if Luther's translation of the Bible had shared the same fate as our hymn-books, which in every Protestant province or city have been so often published by spiritless, unpoetic and terribly dogmatizing or else boldly neologizing compilers. In them our finest hymns are frequently diluted, maimed or reduced to a state of complete deformity! In former days a journeyman of Aalen could sing a spiritual song in brotherly communion with his fellow-crafts men from Göttingen, Bremen, Hamburg or Berlin. But now, hymns have as many various forms as there are cities; now, spiritual concord in singing is hushed and all unity of faith and spirit would cease amongst us, were it not for Luther's Bible." Herder, Goethe, Claudius and Hamann also raised their protest against this hymnological vandalism.

† Baron Von Tucher in the Preface to his "*Schätz des evangelischen Kirchengesangs*," etc. Stuttgart, 1840.

tivity, a lofty estimate of human knowledge, opinion and feeling, the platitude of dull reasoning and moralizing, and thus an extinction of spiritual life and Christian sympathy." Many of the best old chorals were now consigned to oblivion, whilst others were translated from the living, vigorous church-style into the heavy, tedious style of the schools, or displaced by new tunes of a dry, didactic character. According to the maxim then adopted, that slowness is the true measure of solemnity, the dragging monotony of common time with perpetual half notes of equal value, which best harmonized with the spiritual relaxation and prosaic sobriety of the age of "illumination," usurped the place of the old, inspiring rhythm, with its lively movement that well corresponded to the strength and inwardness of faith expressed in the hymns themselves. "Choral singing"—as Koch justly observes*—"lost in this way all its freshness and life, and received an impress of uncommon tediousness, dulness and uniformity, so that one choral seems almost like the other."

Thus Germany, in the name of her consistories and reigning princes, without consulting the people, who had no voice in the matter or vainly resisted it, was in a few years overwhelmed by a real deluge of bulky hymn-books and books of chorals, wholly destitute of spirit and unction, which instead of nourishing piety did more to destroy it than the rationalism taught in the professorial chairs of the universities. At the same time, by reason of the independent position of the multitude of established churches, large and small, in the German States and the Swiss Cantons, which all put forth their own books of hymns and chorals according to a special pattern, there appeared, instead of the earlier spiritual concord of song, a frightful Babylonish confusion, which it will cost great labor to reduce again to harmony,—a task only to be accomplished by a prudent return to the good and old.

Nevertheless, it cannot be said, that the illumination-

* In his work already cited: "*Geschichte des Kirchenlieds und Kirchengesangs*, v. 3. p. 251.

period was productive of *pure mischief*. It has, at least negatively, paved the way for such a reproduction of the old, as will retain its substance, purified from accidental dross, cast into better form, enriched with the gifts of a later age and adapted to the use of the Church of the present. God knows how to bring good even out of the ruin which man has wrought, and is able to turn the apparent obstructions in the path of his Church to her ultimate advantage. Under his wise guidance all errors can but serve at last to aid the triumph of the truth.

The sadly mutilated and disfigured hymnology just portrayed, as one might suppose, has found its way also into the German Churches of *America*. We will here make beforehand two or three honorable exceptions, with the restriction, however, that the book which is the best and most useful amongst them has been taken almost entirely from the new *Württemberg Hymn Book*, with all its defects and errors, and from the first edition of *Knapp's Liederschatz*, now superseded and rendered worthless for critical purposes by a second fully revised and more complete. Most of the American German hymn-books, and those which enjoy the widest circulation, have been derived from the dreary period when religious and churchly life were at their lowest ebb in the fatherland. The contents, obtained from a few secondary sources, are strung together with no previous study or insight, no poetic feeling or taste, no logical order or method, with innumerable blunders in orthography and punctuation, indeed, we may say, with incredible ignorance and carelessness. Many of the very finest classical hymns are altogether omitted, such as "Ein feste Burg ist unser Gott," "Allein zu Dir, Herr Jesu Christ," "Herzlich lieb hab ich Dich, O Herr," "Wie schön leuchtet der Morgenstern," "Wachet auf! ruft uns die Stimme," "Jerusalem, du hochgebaute Stadt," "Verzage nicht, du Häuflein klein," "Eins ist noth, ach Herr, diess Eine," "Wie rühst Du doch so selig, Herr, die Deinen," "Es glänzet der Christen inwendiges Leben," "Es kostet viel ein Christ zu seyn," "Heiliguter Jesu, Heil-

gungsquelle," "Ach, mein Herr Jesu, dein Naheseyn"—in some even the German *Te Deum*: "Nun danket Alle Gott," and others of like character; whilst other old hymns again have been mutilated and abbreviated without the slightest regard to the original text or the internal connection.* To make up for these omissions we are presented with a mass of weak, prosaic and even rationalistic rhymes, such as "Religion, von Gott gegeben," "Tugend ist der Seele Leben," "Des Leibes warten und ihn nähren" "Gott, dass man sich selber liebe, Kann dir nicht zuwider seyn; Denn du pflanzt diese Triebe Unser Brust ja selber ein," "Lass mich, O Gott, gewissenhaft Mein irdisch Gut verwalten," "Laut und majestätisch rollet Ueber uns der Donner hin," "Ich sterb im Tode nicht! Mich-überzeugen Gründe, die ich, je mehr ichforsch', In meinem Wesen finde." And what confusion in the arrangement! Instead of the simple, clear, practical division according to the church-year, or the order of salvation and the development of the Christian life, we have sections like these, "On singing in general," "On the ways of Man to God," "On the ways of God to Man," "On Religion," "On the Ten Commandments," "On the Benefits of Virtue," "On Intercourse with Good Men," "On well-ordered Self-love," "On Contentment with our Condition," "On the lawful Care of Property," "On the Duties of different Classes," "On Duties in regard to the Body," "Duties toward Animals," "At the Departure of Friends," "Death of a Missionary," "Think on the End," "The Rising and Setting of the Sun," and more of the same kind.

* Of the so-called "*Gemeinschaftlichen Gesangbuch*," which is beneath all criticism, a mere publishers' speculation, we do not wish to speak, although, perhaps on account of its cheapness, it has obtained the widest circulation amongst the Lutheran, Reformed and Evangelical Churches. As proof for what we say, take the "*Evangelische Liedersammlung*," which was prepared in the year 1833 by the order and for the use of the Lutheran General Synod, and still in its latest editions bears the worthy names of the Doctors and Pastors, J. G. Schmucker, F. Heyer, A. Lochmann, E. L. Haseilius, S. S. Schmucker, D. F. Schüller and J. G. Morris: This collection has, it is true, retained a considerable number of really excellent hymns from the older Lutheran Hymn Book of Muhlenberg, but according to the mechanical rule, that only three to five stanzas shall be usually sung, they have been almost without exception abbreviated and altered so as sometimes to be scarcely

From this destructive hymnological revolution let us now turn to the *conservative reform*. It began in all earnestness with the newly awakened Christian life in the evangelical Church of Germany after the Napoleonic wars and the celebration of the Centennial Jubilee of the Reformation. Since then, its progress, like that of all reforms in Germany, has been slow, but sure. Already it has produced many excellent practical results. Along with the revival of faith, church-poetry felt a new inspiration and found utterance through gifted and pious singers, like Novalis, Claudius, Arndt, Albertini, Knapp, Spitta, Kern, Bahrdt, Adolph and Friedrich Wilhelm Krummacher, Möwes, Zeller, Stier, Victor Strauss, Puchta, J. P. Lange and Meta Heusser. They have added to the old, hymns which, although scarce equal to the classic productions of the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries in objective popular cast, power, unction and simplicity, often surpass them in the flow, correctness and elegance of their language and deserve an honorable place in every general collection as poetic fruits of the evangelical faith of the nineteenth century.

ly recognizable. Thus, the hymn, "Es ist das Heil uns kommen her," has only four stanzas instead of the original fourteen, "Ich bin getauft auf Deinen Namen," two instead of seven, "In allen meinen Thaten," four instead of fifteen, "Liebe, die du mich zum Bilde," three instead of seven, "Werde Licht, du Volk der Heiden," two instead of fifteen, "Du sagst Ich bin ein Christ," four instead of sixteen, "O Haupt, voll Blut und Wunden," six instead of ten, "Befehl du deine Wege," six instead of twelve, "Wir Menschen sind zu dem, O Gott," five instead of ten, "Der Herr ist Gott und keiner mehr," three instead of eight, "Wir sind die vor Gottes Throne," five instead of fourteen, "Dies ist der Tag, den Gott gemacht," four instead of eleven, and the rest in like ratio. In favor of the compilers it is but fair to state, that the fault in this case lies for the most part with the careless type-setter and proof-reader, as Dr. Schmucker of Gettysburg has lately informed me. His venerable father, the chairman of the committee, compiled this collection from two older American hymn-books (that of Muhlenberg and another published in Baltimore) and handed over these books to the type-setter with a list and the direction to set up of the marked hymns always 1-8 stanzas or 1-5 from the beginning, and the last or the few last at the close; but the type-setter mistook the hyphen for a comma and set up, instead of the first *three* or *five* stanzas, only the *first* and the *fifth*, together with the conclusion! This blunder was overlooked by the proof-reader and first discovered by the author to his great sorrow, when the book had already been stereotyped and could then be only partially corrected. Perhaps it is owing to the same mischance, that this Lutheran hymn-book, among its 420 hymns, has not a single one from the pen of Luther, not even his "Ein feste Burg;" the German Te Deum, "Nun danket Alle Gott," is likewise wanting.

The first movement toward hymnological reform had its actual beginning in the Berlin Synod of the year 1817, since a resolution was there passed to publish a new hymn-book, which appeared in 1829 under the auspices of the celebrated names of Schleiermacher and Thiermin, and in an aesthetical view at least showed decided progress, although it yet stood far behind the present demands of hymnology and presented the older church-hymns for the most part trimmed up artificially like box-trees. Then, accompanied by various schemes for improvement, came critical investigations of the "*Gesangsbuchnoth*" (hymnological desolation) by Moritz Arndt (1819), Wilhelmi (1824), Carl von Raumer (1829 and 1831), Bunsen (1830 and 1833), Rudolph Stier (1835), H. Kraz (1838), C. Grünsisen (1839), and G. Chr. H. Stip (1841 and 1842).

Meanwhile, the treasures of the past, partly in unaltered and partly in polished, modernized forms, either alone, or in connection with the later products of the Christian Muse, have been collected into larger hymnological works, which thus furnish the necessary material for the construction of new hymn-books. To this department belong A. J. Rambach's "*Anthologie christlicher Gesänge*" (1817-1822 in 4 volumes), Bunsen's "*Versuch eines allgem. evangel. Gesang-und Gebetbuchs*" (1833 with 934 hymns), the "*Berliner Liederschatz*" (elaborated by Langbecker and Elsner in 1832 and essentially improved in the 2d ed. of 1840, which contains 1564 hymns), A. Knapp's, "*Evangelischer Liederschatz*" (1837 with 3590 hymns, which are in general far too much altered; then a second edition in 1850 fully reconstructed on essentially different and more correct principles, with 3067 hymns*), K. E. Ph. Wackerna-

* Knapp confesses in the Preface, p. xi, that in the first edition he "had gone to work too subjectively and had overstepped the mark a hundred times." This honest confession does him honor, and, in connection with his undeniable merits as a hymnologist, places him in a better light than his paleologizing opponents Stip and Wackernagel, who have attacked him with merciless severity. The letter in his discourse before the Bremen Church Diet of 1852, p. 143, went so far as to deny him the possession of "any vestige of churchly taste." His second edition, however, has almost rendered the first one useless for critical purposes.

gel's diplomatically accurate "Deutsches Kirchenlied von Luther bis N. Hermann and A. Blaurer" (1842 in 2 volumes), H. A. Daniel's "Evangelisches Kirchengesangbuch" (1842) and the Greek and Latin "Thesaurus Hymnologicus" by the same author (1841-1846 in 5 vols.) J. P. Lange's "Kirchenliederbuch" (1843 with 909 hymns and a hymnological introduction), and E. Kochs' "Geschichte des Kirchenlieds and Kirchengesangs" (2d edition 1852-1854 in 4 volumes).

On the basis of these and similar preparatory works, a number of improved hymn-books for practical use in the churches have been issued, in part by individual hymnologists, as those by C. von Raumer (1831 and 1846 with 564 hymns), by R. Stier (1835 with 915 hymns), by Bunsen (1846 with 440 hymns), by Stip, or rather by the Evangelische Bücherverein in Berlin (1851 with 879 hymns), and by A. Knapp (1855 with 730 hymns); partly also by commissions for entire state-churches, as that of Berlin (1829 with 876 hymns), that of Württemberg first in 1839 with wise foresight merely on trial, then in 1842 formally published, with 651 hymns), that of Schaffhausen (1841), that of Hamburg (1843 with 784 hymns), that of Aarau (1844 with 360 hymns), that of Reformed Elberfeld (1853 with 243 hymns along with the psalms), that of Bavaria (1854 with 573 hymns), that of Basel (1854 with 405 hymns), that of Silesia (1855), that of Osnabrück (1856 with 200 hymns), that of Lubeck (1855, on trial, with 450 hymns), that of Hesse (1855), that of Lutheran Elberfeld (1857 with 522 hymns), and several more, some of which are still waiting for the formal sanction of their respective church-authorities. Among these new hymn-books of the state-churches, that of Württemberg is the most popular and has the widest circulation. Beyond question, especially if compared with the earlier one of 1791, it possesses great value, but, to its own detriment, it appeared about ten years too soon, and is, besides, somewhat too local in its character. It has paid too little regard to the old, and too much to the new, for which reason Koch compares it to an auction, in which the people, instead of the full sum,

receive only about 60 or 70 per cent. But the book which deserves the highest respect, both on account of its origin and design, is the "Deutsche Evangelische Kirchengesangbuch in 150 Kernlieder," first proposed by the Berlin Church Conference of the year 1846, then decided on by the German Church Diet at Bremen in 1852 and finally prepared and published, in 1853, along with appropriate tunes, by the Eisenach Church Conference through a commission composed of the most able hymnologists from the various State-Churches (the Doctors Vilmar, Bähr, Daniel, Wackernagel, Pastor Geffcken, Baron von Tucher and Dr. Faisst). This book ought henceforth to form a common ground-work for all new German hymn-books and thus aid in doing away the lamentable confusion, which now prevails in the text of hymns and in the melodies. The plan is excellent and the execution has succeeded as far as one could fairly expect in such a difficult task under the present circumstances. And yet the book has met with only a limited reception, and for the reasons mainly, because it has been constructed on principles manifestly too archaeological and Lutheran (although, on the other side, untrue to its method, it has abbreviated too much and altered such hymns as "Schmücke dich, o liebe Seele," on which account, Wackernagel, who opposed any alterations whatever, withdrew from the commission); and because, moreover, it excludes entirely not only all hymn-writers since the year 1750, but also those of the poetic school of Spener, of the Moravians, from whom not a single one has been taken, and even of the Reformed Church, which, of its 150 hymns, has furnished barely 4 (from the pens of Joachim Neander and Louisa Henrietta of Brandenburg), thus doing open violence to the principle of the Evangelical Union.* Therefore, we must award to the counter-project of Dr. Geffcken, a member of the Eisenach Conference,

* The Lutheran Koch has justly remarked (v. iv. p. 723), that the single hymn of Tersteegen, "Gott ist gegenwärtig" would outweigh a large number of the Eisenach Collection, and that the entire exclusion of the hymns of Tersteegen, G. Arnold, J. C. Schada, Richter, J. J. Rambach, Bogatsky, Ph. Fr. Hiller, Gotter, Zinzendorf and Lampe is the more worthy of censure, because all these poets lived before the year 1750 and are of the most distinguished rank.

although on the whole less satisfactory, a partial preference, and consider the Eisenach scheme merely as a first attempt upon a new path, which like all first attempts should be regarded with due honor and respect.

This hymnological reform has indeed borne fruits of the highest value to the Christian world, but the results as yet fall far below the general want, and hence there is wide room for progress. Its final aim cannot be a blind restoration of all the old, and an arbitrary rejection of all the new, fixing the year 1750 as the dividing line, just as if the fountains of church-poetry had at that time dried up forever and the Holy Spirit forsaken the churches. We must rather endeavor to unite old and new in one harmonious whole by careful selection and due reverence for original purity. The reactionary, antiquarian leaning of a Stip and a Wackernagel, which would retain at all hazards even such hymns as Luther's "*Steur' des Pabsts und Türken Mord*," in spite of the manifest consumption of the latter, although they are not suited to our age, especially in America†, has indeed its full historical right and merit against the opposite extreme of subjective modernizing, but is itself also an extreme. The true course no doubt lies betwixt stiff antiquarianism on the one side and a rage for amendment on the other, thus, in a loving resuscitation of the old and good in a form adapted to the present want, and a free use of the finest products of our time, in which the Spirit of God is moving powerfully among the churches and waking the dead bones to life again. It should no longer be denied, that in every new hymnological work we must pass beyond the period of rationalistic adulteration to primitive sources and treat the old hymns with conscientious fidelity. On this historical path alone can anything beneficial be accomplished. But, on the other hand, we must discriminate between a scientific collection for historical and critical purposes and a popular hymn-book for

† Among those on this side of the water, the Old Lutheran Hymn Book of St. Louis alone occupies this position, having been prepared according to the strictest archaistic principles.

practical use in Christian congregations. Then it is to be remembered, that the old church-hymns are neither divinely inspired psalms, nor even symbolical books, although they stand next to the latter and are in a certain measure more important for the people. The present age, with its linguistic culture and taste, and the congregations, with their practical wants, have also their rights, which must be duly respected and honored. The old hymns could not lose, but only gain and become generally acceptable, if purged of grammatical errors (such as, "ihr englischen Chören" for Chöre, "die offnen Liebesarmen" for Liebesarme, "Koste" for Kost), of antiquated—we do not mean antique—forms of words (as, "leit" for liegt, "tügen" for taugen, "ferren" for fern), of unintelligible and offensive expressions (like "Osterfladen," "Eya," "Sündenkoth," "Sündengrind"), of Latinisms (such as, "Lasset die Muscam hören," "Potentaten," "Lucerne," "Consorten," "in dulci júbilo," "cithara," "coeli rosa"), as well as of defective figures and allegorical fancies (of most frequent occurrence in Pietistic and Moravian hymns),—provided, these improvements were made with conscientious and tender regard and caution, with cultivated taste and in the sense and spirit of the hymn, the poet and his age,—just as near as possible to what the author himself would now make, if he were living amongst us. On account of the extraordinary length and prolonged repetitions of many of the finest hymns, a prudent regard to economy of space and cheapness not seldom renders abbreviation admissible,—provided it does no injury to the unity and completeness of the hymn and confers on it greater terseness, polish and utility.

It is now high time to make the results of this hymnological investigation and hymn-book reform available for the German churches of America, and that not by a slavish transfer from this or that *liederschatz* or hymn-book, but on the basis of an independent study of original sources, with a free use of the best aids from every quarter. Preachers and congregations have been long wishing for a book constructed on certain, fixed hymnological principles.

The aim of the present collection is to meet this desire. It was prepared with much labor and conscientious industry from the best hymnological resources accessible to us, originally by the order and for the use of the Reformed Church, yet without any denominational narrowness and with continual regard to the common need of the German churches in the United States. The present large or critical edition is designed chiefly for a smaller circle of readers, but will soon be followed by a cheaper one of less size in which the critical apparatus will be omitted. Whether the work is indeed suited to the wants of the time, experience must decide. Hence we will confine ourselves to the announcement of the general principles which have guided us in its preparation, with the simple remark that even the best hymnological principles in their application to concrete material may be obliged to undergo considerable modification, practical wants and economical necessities often standing in the way of strict rules. Thus we were forced, against our wish, to abbreviate a number of hymns and wholly exclude more than sixty others, because they would have made the book too bulky and too dear.

1. A hymn-book, to meet the demands of the present state of scientific hymnology and at the same time the practical wants of the congregation, should, if possible, contain only classic hymns, derived from all ages and divisions of the Church, from the psalms of David down to the latest products of the Christian Muse, in a word, such hymns as are distinguished by genuine Scriptural and devotional contents and poetic worth, by sacred unction, depth and purity of feeling, dignity and simplicity of language and fitness for being sung, whether already in general use, or not;—whilst, on the other hand, offensive dogmatism, subjective caprice or mediocrity in contents and form, prosaic dullness, weak sentimentalism and trifling, artificial phraseology, a dry, didactic tone and similar defects warrant the exclusion of such hymns as have found admittance into most of our American hymn-books, although they have never met with any special favor among the people.

2. The original text, as it flowed from the poetic inspiration of the author and is contained in the first editions of his hymns or in the most reliable and best acknowledged hymn-books, must in all cases form the standard, deviations from which can only be allowed, where the laws of language and taste, or regard to the actual wants of the congregation, render them necessary and desirable.

3. The arrangement should so blend the order of the Apostle's Creed and the evangelical Church Year together, that in it the historical course of the divine plan of redemption as well as the development of the Christian life from conversion and regeneration on to the resurrection of the body and the fruition of heavenly bliss should be mirrored in a simple, graphic and complete manner for convenient practical use.

4. Within the particular divisions, the chronological order should be followed wherever possible, so that the stream of the Christian life can be traced in church-song from the singers of Israel through the Apostolic age, the old Catholic period and the Reformation until now, presenting thus a bird's eye view of the essential unity and diversity of faith and worship.

5. The Reformed hymn-writers of earlier and later times—John Zwick, Joachim Neander, Louisa Henrietta of Brandenburg, Lampe, Tersteegen, Annoni, Zollikoffer, Pauli, Lavater, Adolph and F. W. Krummacher, Hagenbach, J. P. Lange and Meta Heusser-Schweizer—deserve more consideration than they have generally received in German hymn-books. Just as little should the finest hymns of the Moravians and the modern Evangelical Church be passed over, and in a work designed for America, good translations from English authors like Watts, Wesley, Cowper and Newton are altogether in place.

6. The critical and explanatory remarks, which introduce the hymns, somewhat in the manner of the superscriptions of the Hebrew psalms, were added last, and are only intended for the large edition. Although better suited for a collection of a purely scientific and literary character,

they will no doubt prove very acceptable to many ministers and layman, because they give in brief compass a great deal of interesting information, brought together from a number of sources, some of them difficult of access. They contain one feature altogether new—the references to successful English translations,—by which the compiler hoped to prepare the way for transplanting many of the best German hymns into English-American collections which may hereafter be prepared for use in the Churches. The friends of German hymnology will rejoice to see their blessed influence extending thus beyond their original limits into another tongue.

7. In its style of publication, the work far surpasses any American-German hymn-book that has yet appeared, and is equal to any of those published in the English language.

Such are the principles, which were constantly kept in view by the author. And yet, he is fully conscious that the work is imperfect and below his own ideal of what a German hymn-book should be. Nor does he look for universal approval. He simply asks those who may miss this or that favorite hymn in its pages, to observe that about a hundred hymns are found here, which are contained in no other American collection, and to remember that in the nature of things it is not possible to satisfy the claims and wishes of every individual. Of the truly classic hymns few will be found missing, and the candid critic will be obliged to confess that not a single one has been admitted, which does not breathe the spirit of genuine Christianity and can not be sung or read with profit. We, therefore, in good hope consign this book to the German evangelical Churches of America, with the wish and prayer that to all who use it the Lord will make it a source of rich blessing until it has fulfilled its mission and given place at last to a better.

T. C. P.

ART. V.—RELIGION AND CHRISTIANITY.

SECOND ARTICLE.

In our previous article on the difference between the religions of the world and Christianity, we considered the question mainly in its negative aspect. We endeavored to show that certain received distinctions are not valid. To say that Christianity is revealed, true, for the whole world and of the Spirit, whilst religion is natural, false, sectional and of the flesh, does not proceed upon a correct view of the real principle of difference, and fails therefore to exhibit the two things in their objective relation to each other. We propose now to examine the question in its positive aspect. What is the objective relation of Christianity to religion; or what is the real principle of difference; and in what does the difference consist?

A correct answer to this enquiry can be deduced only from a correct view of the essential nature of Christianity.

To the question: What is Christianity? we reply: It is not a method by which God maintains and vindicates His moral government over intelligent creatures. It is not a series of truths announced to the world from time to time by the Holy Spirit through inspired men. It is not a plan of infinite wisdom to fulfil eternal and immutable decrees. It is not principally an atonement for the sins of men accomplished by our Lord on the cross. Much less is it primarily a state of mind or state of feeling experienced by believers. Nor is it a system of belief; nor a mode of worshipping God; nor a life of holiness.

Each of these propositions contains a truth. Christianity exhibits Almighty God as the absolute Governor of all worlds. It includes many infallible truths recorded by men who spake and wrote as they were moved by the Holy Ghost. It reveals and fulfils the eternal purposes of God; and provides a complete atonement in Christ who hath "appeared to put away sin by the sacrifice of Himself." It also proposes to mankind the only proper object of faith;

and, when embraced from the heart according to the Word of God, begets a state of mind and feeling, that leads necessarily to devout adoration and godly living. But, whilst all these truths are comprehended in Christianity, no one of them nor all taken together express or represent its *principle* and essential nature. Each truth is such because it belongs to the Christian system, but can not stand for the essence of the Christian system itself.

Christianity is something that possesses substantial being. It is not a system of divine thought; but a real existence—an existence as real as the visible, tangible natural world around us; as real as the tree, the rock or the sun. By *real* we mean that that to which the attribute belongs is an objective constitution; not a thought, or the expression of a thought, but an object of thought. The Real is what it is whether known or not known, whether felt or not felt; its qualities and essence do not come from human intellect or will, but are derived from the creative word of God; yet the qualities and essence of the Real become such for man only by entering into a relation to him through sensation or thought. In such sense the tree is real; real in itself, and real for man. It has a law of life, and qualities and inherent relations to surrounding objects which are constitutive of the tree itself. These essential elements are in no way depending on man's knowledge of them; but man's knowledge depends on *them*. The tree is a *thing*; therefore man may see it and know it; and by knowing it, it becomes real for his consciousness. In such sense also is Christianity real. It is an objective order of existence, whose principle, law of life and inherent qualities are all substantive elements of being. Human thinking can neither make it nor unmake it; it is no more real when men receive it in faith, and no less real when men reject it in unbelief. Constituted by God, Christianity confronts man from without, as the material universe does, an object of indescribable grandeur and power.

Possessing objective existence, the constitution of Christianity is external to the mind of man. Through faith

man may partake of its life, may acquire correct ideas of its nature, and in thought develop a system of knowledge corresponding to the being of Christianity. Yet the being of Christianity is distinct from a correct theory of it, or from a genuine experience of its grace. The one is the external reality existing in virtue of its relation to God; the other is a true apprehension of the reality acquired by a believing study of it as set forth in the Bible.

If Christianity be veritable being; if it be external to the individual and to the mind of man and exist solely in virtue of its relation to God; it is also independent of human knowledge and feeling. The constitution of Christianity exists independently of all science and art, of morals and civilization; independently of any opinions or dispositions that any individual or age may cherish with regard to it. The opinions of men may be true or false, consistent or contradictory; it nevertheless stands untouched as to its essential nature. We do not imply that Christianity can accomplish its purpose independently of human knowledge. Its design is to save men from sin by restoring them to living communion with God in Christ—a design the accomplishment of which involves a personal participation in the life of Christ. A Christian is a member of Christ—a branch of the True Vine. This certainly implies experience—human thought, knowledge, feeling, desire, will and action. A man is saved only in the degree that he lives, thinks and acts according to the law of the spirit of life in Christ Jesus. But to admit all this is simply to say in other words that man depends entirely on Christianity; not that Christianity depends on him.

We must not put the effect for the cause. Here is the source of much confusion and error. We can not identify a thing with the human conception of it, or with the influence which it exerts. We can not, for example, identify the vegetable kingdom with the science of botany. The botanist investigates the nature of plants, and may construct a system, true in principle, beautiful in its arrangement and complete in all its parts. But for this rea-

son the vegetable kingdom does not exist in the mind of the botanist; nor does its objective order and force depend on his scientific knowledge. The vegetable kingdom continues to be external to him; and he remains dependent upon it as before. So does the objective order of Christianity continue external to and independent of the Christian. The Christian leans on Christianity, thinks of it, feels its power, and is saved by it in soul and body; but for this reason we can not imagine that Christianity is a theory; or that it is no more than what is experienced in the mind and heart of the believer. To resolve Christianity into a correct system of doctrines and subjective experience, is a confusion as great as it would be to resolve the vegetable kingdom into the science of botany.

Acknowledge Christianity to be an objective order of being, possessing substantive qualities, no less real, to say the least, than the order of the material universe; and it follows by necessary consequence that it is external to the mind of man, not in his mind; that it exists independently of theology and all practical religion. Hence to confound it with the effect which it produces in man or in society, or with the glorious end which it accomplishes, is to overthrow the very basis upon which sound doctrine and Christian experience rest.

The object or holy reality, now, which we name Christianity, and to which these substantive qualities belong, is the *Person* and *work* of Christ. Christ Himself including both what He is, what He did, what He is doing and will do, is Christianity. His conception in the womb of Mary by the miraculous overshadowing of the Holy Ghost; His birth, life, miracles, sufferings, death, burial, resurrection, ascension, intercession, Headship, coming to Judgment, together with all the other future transactions of His life, are constituent parts, organically connected, of an order mediated at every stage of its development by the Holy Ghost, of which Jesus Christ is the principle and the substance: the principle as denoting that from which the order is developed by the agency of the Holy Ghost; and the substance as denoting that in the entire organism in virtue of

whom these constituent parts exist and possess saving power for men. Christ being the principle and substance of His work, He is inseparable from it, and from all the facts of His life. Not the words uttered, and the things done and suffered by Him, constitute Christianity. Not His work in distinction from Himself; but Christ and His work, or Christ in His work—the Son of God clothing Himself in manhood, acting, suffering, dying, triumphing over the powers of darkness, sitting at the right hand of God, ruling over all things for the glory of His Church, and coming again to judge the world in righteousness;—this is that sublime order of mysterious existence established and continued in the world by the Holy Ghost, in which Christianity as an objective reality consists.

It is therefore divine. Not divine simply because it has its origin in God. All things, inert matter no less than the human spirit, have their origin in the creative will and power of God, and are, therefore, in a certain sense, divine. But Christianity is divine both as to its origin and as to its essence. The Godhead in the person of the Eternal Son enters into its very constitution. Its substantive being is divine. "Without controversy, great is the mystery of godliness: God was manifest in the flesh, justified in the Spirit, seen of angels, preached unto the Gentiles, believed on in the world, received up into glory." (1 Tim 3: 16.) It is the Son of God who is the fundamental constituent, nay the very substance, of the sublime mystery as it passes through its different stages of development in time, from the moment of conception in the womb of the virgin to His return in triumph, with His glorified Church, into the glory which He had with the Father before the world was.

Divine as to its original substance, Christianity is divine in every objective fact, or act of Christ, entering into and forming an integral part of the whole. It is not only a glorious plan of redemption—a scheme devised by infinite wisdom and exhibited or announced to the world in visible symbols or human language. It is this indeed, but

much more also. The plan of redemption, or the idea of the new creation, becomes a veritable fact, taking place in time and space as really as the plan of the material world, or the idea of the first creation, became a fact, an objective reality, when in the beginning God made heaven and earth. The fact or thing done is that the Son of God, God of God, took upon Him the form of a servant, and was made in the likeness of man; that, being found in fashion as a man, He—the Person who, being in the form (*μορφή*) of God thought it not robbery to be equal with God—*He* humbled Himself, and became obedient unto death, even the death of the cross. (Phil. 2 : 6-8.) Christ is not merely sustained by God on the cross, and then raised from the dead by His power operating as an external force of which the entombed Crucified One is but the passive subject. But the entire work of Christ done in space and time, was divine no less than His Person. The vicarious offering for sin on the cross as well as all the other incomprehensible acts of humiliation were, without a figure, the acts of God, the acts of the second Person in the Godhead, performing the work of redemption in the form of a servant.

The divine in Christianity, however, does not exclude the human. The divine, on the contrary, supposes and includes the human. Christianity is human as truly as it is divine; not human in appearance only or in outward form, but in reality. The human belongs to the constitution of Christ. The eternal Son of God would not be Christ were He not properly man; had He not been conceived miraculously, and born conformably to the law of humanity; had He not possessed a rational soul and a material body; had He not lived and died in the concrete form of man as really as before the incarnation, He existed only in the form of God. In Christ two forms of being are united; not brought together externally or held in juxtaposition and mechanical harmony; nor identified temporarily—the essential qualities of the one becoming the essential qualities of the other; but two forms of being are one organically; both, though neither nature ceases to be

itself properly, being equally essential to the mysterious constitution of His Person.

The human nature being a part of the constitution of Christ's person, it belongs also to His work. As He is, so is also that which He does—divine-human. Not divine-human during particular periods of His life; but divine-human in all the acts of His life on earth, whether He walks on the turbulent waters of Galilee or submits to an ignominious crucifixion by brutal Roman soldiers between two thieves on Calvary; human in His triumph over death and hell, and in His ascension to the throne of the universe. Not human in His acts done in time only, but human also in the consummating acts done in eternity. Christianity is something new and grand—a new creation for the making alive and bringing back again of the old. It conjoins what sin has rent asunder—man and God. It conjoins what human reason, active under the separative power of sin, would hold and even struggles to hold asunder in systems of philosophy and theology. And it conjoins in a concrete order of being what the reason, governed in its thinking by the negative power of sin, would resolve into abstract doctrines or into an unsubstantial metaphysical theory.

Christianity being divine as to its essence, it is supernatural. The word *divine* designates the substantial being of Christianity as it is considered in itself and under one aspect; whilst *supernatural* names the relation which the Christian system in its constitution and in all its manifestations sustains to the first creation. The being of Christianity is not derived from the operation of any law or principle in the constitution of the natural world. Its origin is above and lies beyond the world. In its life and laws; in its power and operation; in its method of development and progress; in its entire order and all its demands, effects, and results; it is determined by a principle which the first creation according to its very idea does not and can not comprehend. To the first creation belong the powers and laws of the human reason no less than the forces and laws of all forms of matter. The being of Christi-

anity is not a product of any laws and forces in the world's physical constitution. It is not the product of any powers and laws of the human reason or of the constitution of the moral world; whether we regard these vast powers and these higher laws as they operate in any particular person or age, or as they operate through the succession of all the ages in the course of history. The fruit of all learning, of all metaphysical research sustained by the highest non-christian civilization and social refinement, combined with every experiment in civil institutions, social revolutions and philosophico-religious systems, was not even the idea or conscious want of that in which the being of Christianity consists. A felt want there was and had always been from the beginning, which gave rise to external fantastic caricatures of the Truth in schools of art, modes of social life and ceremonies of religion; but no more. So really does both the Truth itself and the proper idea of it, lie above the capacities and resources of nature.

Yet as the being of Christianity is not the divine to the exclusion of the human, but the divine in the human, it is natural as really as supernatural. Man is constitutionally connected with all the lower orders of nature. The component particles of matter which enter as inert physical elements into his body, are the very substances which as gases, liquids or solids, each subject to a specific law, we find in masses of earth, in the beautiful formations of the crystal, in the organic structure of the plant, and in the higher and more complicated frame-work of the animal. The plastic power of the plant in virtue of which, when the necessary conditions are present, the slumbering type of a complete and symmetrical organism is developed from a germ, is the same power that from the moment of conception operates in the production of a human being, first in the embryonic state forming bone, muscle, figure et cetera, from the living substance of the mother, and then after birth appropriating gaseous, mineral and vegetable elements from the surrounding world; thus by a mysterious process of transformation and assimilation developing the

unique and wonderful physical frame-work of a full-grown man. The instinct of the animal or the inherent felt tendency to lay hold of and appropriate suitable objects under the direction of sense for the satisfaction of natural wants, producing innumerable phenomena analogous to those of human intelligence and will, is the same physical impulse or law of feeling which, though involving higher possibilities and relations because in a rational being, rules in the phenomena of infant life and underlies and gives direction to the desires, inclinations and passions of the human heart. Animal and human instinct are the activity of the same law of physical feeling, modified in its manifestations by the generic difference of these two forms of animated being.

Sustaining this internal relation to lower orders of existence, man becomes the culminating point of all the kingdoms and subdivisions of the natural world. Not only are the various classes of inert matter comprehended organically in him, but all the dynamic forces of inorganic substances as well as the laws of inanimate and animate organisms are present in him under the form of the most perfect terrene constitution. Such a perfect organization of nature, he is in sympathy with its subordinate formations; and, when true to his position and relations, his entire physical life is in harmony with the dynamic forces and organic laws of the material world.

This internal relation of man to the world holds true of reason and will no less than of the body. The categories and laws of thought answer to the demands of all terrene orders of existence, and to the demands of the universe. Man may cast the entire creation in the mold of his mind and then hold it in idea as it is in itself; and, so far from doing violence to himself or to it, he only actualizes the design of his relative position as a thinking being. Enlightened reason is the language of nature's harmonious order. Coming up from the lowest deep of chaos and touching all the chords in the ascending scale of inorganic and organic existence, the notes of harmony, deepening and

swelling as they rise, resound as the sublimest music in the clear bright dome of mind.

In virtue of will, by divine grace, man thinks, resolves and acts conformably to the law of God. He holds himself in all the powers of mind and body, in all his plans, and every relation of life, subordinate to the Creator and Lord of all things. The things, beings and relations which God has put under him, he holds in subordination to himself; and, through himself in subordination to God. Thus the objective original unity and harmony of the universe are reproduced by reason and will in the sphere of human consciousness and morality. Human personality generically different from material organization on the one hand and God on the other, is yet the connecting link between the natural and supernatural, between the lower and higher, and between the lowest and highest order of being. The free and intelligent exponent of the unity of all the forces and laws culminating in humanity, the human person gives utterance through faith in Christ to the symphonies of nature, which go up in adoration and praise before the Throne of God: Holy, Holy, Holy, Lord God of Sabaoth: heaven and earth are full of the majesty of Thy glory. .

If Christ be a true man; if His humanity be not a phantasm nor an imposing divine illusion; He must sustain the same relation in body and soul in all respects to the powers and order of nature, the corrupting and disturbing influences of sin only excepted, that the race of Adam does. If the body of man comprehends the different elements of the material world, and possesses them as integral parts of the highest terrene organism; if the human reason reproduces the order of nature in categories and according to laws of thought corresponding to the objective forms and laws of lower existences; and if by the power of faith the will holds all inferior forms of being in conscious subordination and subserviency to self, and self with whatever it embodies and represents in conscious subordination and subserviency to Almighty God; then Jesus Christ,

being a true man, bone of our bone and flesh of our flesh, occupies the same relative position. As the Head of the human race He is the Head of the natural world, and as such He exhibits and utters the harmonies of all matter, all forces and laws, and of all created mind and spirit.

We proceed one step further. If Christianity be Jesus Christ; if His person, uniting true manhood to true Godhead, constitutes the objective being of Christianity, including all the acts of His mediatorial life from His conception to the restitution of all things; then is Christianity a natural no less than a supernatural order of being. A supernatural order of divine life, it is at the same time a natural order of human life, conforming to all the spiritual, moral, intellectual, social and physical laws of mankind, and answering also to the forms of being existing in every department of nature below man.

It is supernatural because superhuman—supernatural as to its origin and essential being. Its origin is not in man and therefore not in the constitution of nature, but in God. God so loved the world that He gave His only begotten Son, that whosoever believeth in Him should not perish, but have everlasting life. And the essential being of Christianity is no finite or created entity, or power or influence; but it is properly divine; divine in the same sense in which the Godhead is divine. It is the eternal Son of God, the second Person of the glorious Godhead, in fulfilment of the promise and prophecies, performing the work of redemption in the form of man, and agreeably to the laws and conditions of time and space. Therefore Christianity is human also; and because human it is natural. The Son of God is made man. He is perfect God, and perfect man, of a reasonable soul and human flesh subsisting.* The divine taking the human into organic union with itself, the human enters into the essence or constitution of Christianity as really as the divine. Entering as a constituent into Christianity, the capacities of the human

* *Symbolum quicunque, or Athanasian Creed*

are not ignored and set aside ; the new creation does not disregard any want or tendency in humanity, whether inherent by original creation or supervenient through the fall ; but its deepest capacities and wants are met and satisfied. Nor is any law of humanity suspended or violated ; but the hypostatical relation of the human to the divine in the Person of Christ is a fact constituted in obedience to the first necessity of man. From the depths of its heart, humanity cries out after close communion with God.

Therefore is the incarnation a fact conformable to the demands of nature also. No law of humanity is violated ; there is on the contrary a profound capacity of the human for organic union with the divine and therefore an intensely felt and a conscious longing in all ages, though not comprehended, for the possession of an absolute substantive good. With this capacity and longing of humanity nature sympathizes in all its departments. When mankind fell in Adam the curse of God was not limited to man, but was pronounced upon the ground also for man's sake ; and it brought forth thorns and thistles. (Gen. 3: 17-19.) The Apostle Paul adds : we know that the whole creation groaneth and travaileth in pain together until now. There is a like sympathy of the creation with man in his redemption. This truth is necessarily to be inferred from the internal connection of the human body, which as really as the soul is a partaker of the salvation of Christ, with organic and inorganic orders of being below him. But we are not left to logical inference. It is plainly taught in the Bible ; and frequently implied when not directly expressed. Paul says : The earnest expectation of the creature waiteth for the manifestation of the sons of God. For the creature was made subject to vanity, not willingly, but by reason of him who hath subjected the same in hope ; because the creature itself also shall be delivered from the bondage of corruption into the glorious liberty of the sons of God. (Rom. 8: 19-21.) This sympathy of nature with man in his fall and redemption arises from the fact that they are parts of but one constitution.

A radical change in either must affect both. Hence if Christianity be human no less than divine, and conformable to the laws of humanity, it is also natural no less than supernatural, and conformable to the profoundest demands as well as expressive of the inmost sense of the natural world. As Christianity does not violate the constitution of man but satisfies his deepest wants, so neither does it violate the constitution of the natural world but puts it in a position and a relation which answers to the idea of the first creation. A position and a relation, however, which, obscured and repressed by the power of moral and physical evil, the course of history has as yet only partially realized, but which shall be made manifest in glory when He who is the Resurrection and the Life shall, with the perfected redemption of His Church, bring forth the new heavens and the new earth, wherein dwelleth righteousness.

According to the view of Christianity which we have thus far endeavored to unfold, it is an objective order of being which is divine, and therefore supernatural; but an order which is constituted in organic union with, and in the form of the human and natural.

It follows that Christianity is also absolute and infinite. It is absolute, or the Absolute itself. Christ, who is true and eternal God, is self-conditioned and therefore unconditioned. He is what He is of Himself only. There is no object, material or spiritual, no power or force, no state or nature of things temporal or eternal, no conceivable possibility or contingency, on which His being or attributes depend. The conception of dependence or conditionality contradicts the very idea of the divine being of Jesus Christ; and contradicts every representation of Him as given in the Sacred Scriptures. He was in the beginning with God. (John 1: 1.) All things were made by Him; and without Him was not anything made that was made. (Ibid, 3.) *Πάντα δι' αὐτοῦ ἐγένετο*; all, or the All came to be by and from Him; the preposition *δια* denoting in this passage no less the efficient cause than the mediate agency.*

* See Winer's Grammar of N. T. § 51, (1)

Kai χωρὶς αὐτοῦ ἐγένετο οὐδὲ ἓν ὃ γέγονεν; without the Logos not one of all that was or is, whether a thing or original relation, a normal power or influence, came to be. This one truth the Apostle John expresses in two ways, positively and negatively; first affirming all things to be by Him; and then denying that any one thing came into existence by any other person or power; thus setting forth the Logos as absolute with the greatest force of which human thought and language are capable. Col. 1: 16, 17 is a passage of similar force. The Apostle uses three prepositions to express the manifold relation of *all things*, τὰ πάντα, to the Son: ἐν, *by*, all things were created *by* Him, as the producing cause; δια, *through*, all things were created *through* Him, as the mediating Logos; and εἰς *to* or *for*, all things were created *for* Him, as the *end* for whom they continue to be. The words τὰ πάντα, *all things*, must be taken, according to Winer, than whom we can have no better authority in New Testament philology, in its broadest sense; as signifying *the all*, the whole of things, *every thing which exists*.^{*} Christ, accordingly, conditions all things, whilst He, the true God, is unconditioned. We can in consequence not speak of the nature of things as eternal and unchangeable. Whatever belongs to the category of *things*, or *nature of things*, has a beginning in His almighty will, is determined as to its constitution by Him, is upheld in its being and relations by Him, and changes or ceases to be at His good pleasure. The uniform operation of the laws of nature or the eternal fitness of thing, as it is sometimes called, however inexplicable and wonderful to the finite understanding, is after all nothing more than a relative, mutable and contingent fact.

If absolute, Christ is also infinite. He has no limits as to His being and attributes. He is an infinite being possessing infinite attributes. He is both absolute and infinite; not conditioned and not limited. Absolute and infinite are but different aspects of Himself, or predicates of

^{*} Winer; § 17, 4; § 52, 3; § 54, 6.

Himself as God. In Him they are one. The revealing and revealed God is without all conditions, and beyond all limits.

As the person of Christ in connection with all the acts of His mediatorial life is that in which Christianity consists, it is like Himself absolute and infinite. Christianity as divine and supernatural, is an absolute and infinite order of being. It is and presents to the eye of faith, as a concrete reality, the object of thought which the philosophy of all ages has in vain struggled to apprehend. What the first intuition of the reason postulates; what the laws of thinking and the processes of reasoning assume and begin with; what all the tendencies of man's intellectual and moral being presuppose; what the profoundest speculations of Jewish, Pagan and Christian philosophy have sought to determine;—that the objective order of Christianity is in concrete form; and, when recognized and received, must satisfy the conditions of every scientific and philosophical problem—must answer every real question which the human reason can put concerning the Absolute and Infinite.

But Christ is not the Absolute and Infinite in the form of the absolute and infinite. Such He is, but not such only. Were He such only, He would be unknown and unapproachable to the finite and fallen human reason; He would be above and beyond the horizon of vision. He could not be known, because the categories of human knowledge are relative and finite. The human reason could neither affirm nor deny any attribute or relation of Him. Nor could He be approached in faith, because, in consequence of the fall, there is an inconceivable chasm, an impassable gulf, between God and man, which in the nature of the case man can not bridge over. Sin has separated man from, and set him against, God. Every attempt to pass over in worship and thought or knowledge, has resulted, and can result only in a livelier sense and clearer consciousness of the deep abyss of human helplessness and misery. God must approach man in his helpless state, if man shall approach God. The gulf impassable to man,

God must pass, and so pass it as to remove it forever. This is done in the person of Christ. Christ, as God in man, is the Absolute in the form of the relative; and the Infinite in the form of the finite. He is the relative and the finite in that He is the true human. Approaching man in the form of man, the Absolute and Infinite come within the horizon of human vision; meet the necessary conditions of human knowledge; conform to the laws of thinking; and therefore are accessible both to faith and to reason. Confronting man in the form of his own being, the Absolute is not only the object of worship, but the legitimate object of thought.

But the relative and finite form of the Absolute and Infinite is not an abstract form. It is not a finite conception that reveals and presents Infinite Being; not a finite category of thought; nor a logical formula; nor a profound theory; nor any principle as it may stand in the sphere of thinking. It is no intellectual abstraction in which the Infinite is and reveals itself, or in which the Infinite satisfies the necessities of the finite mind. The finite form of manifestation is finite *being*. The finite form is humanity—a concrete form. Absolute Being confronts the human mind, becomes the object of thought, in the form of relative being; Infinite Being in the form of finite being. The Absolute and Infinite stand in the relative and finite order of human being; and are conformable to all normal relations of humanity. Not then a notion or conception, but an objective entity; not a logical formula, but substantial existence; not an intellectual theory of man, but man himself, is the concrete form of the absolute and infinite One. The person of Christ becomes the solution for faith and reason of the profoundest problem of all ages. As the absolute and infinite One he answers to and fills out the idea of God or of a Supreme Power, the first intuition of the reason, underlying and inwoven with every process of ratiocination. As relative and finite Man, He exists in the sphere of sense and thought, corresponds to the categories of thinking, and is known in obedience to the funda-

mental laws of human knowledge. As the union of both, the Absolute in the Relative, the Infinite in the Finite, He embodies and exhibits the objective *relation* of these two orders of being in a concrete reality ; an objective relation the belief and idea of which underlie all worship, philosophy and practical life, but which non-Christian reflection has always developed into some system of Pantheism or Dualism. Christ accordingly satisfies the threefold primary necessity of mankind : He is the true and highest object of faith ; He is that object in the only form which is accessible to human reason ; and thus reconciles faith and reason, or life and logical reflection.

The character of Christ is the character of Christianity. For it is Himself performing the work of human redemption in time and space. Divine and human as to essential being, all its attributes and relations are two-fold, absolute and relative, infinite and finite, eternal and temporal. Just as it is a supernatural order of life existing in the sphere of the infinite and finite both, uniting them mysteriously ; so does it belong to the sphere of eternity and time. Not to any limited period of time. Not to a particular age in the past. But Christianity is in and for all time. Beginning in the incarnation, and triumphing over all opposition in the resurrection and ascension of Christ, it is inaugurated as the Church with peculiar organs, functions and resources, by the outpouring of the Holy Ghost on the day of Pentecost, and perpetuated throughout all the succeeding ages, subject to the conditions of time and place and to all the modifying influences of fallen humanity. It enters into history. It develops itself in virtue of its divine being, yet in harmony with the laws of human life. Or rather history becomes the time form of this eternal constitution ; human life the finite and relative form of the organized divine power of salvation present in the world.

The Church being the mystical body of Christ, the organic continuation of Christianity by the ministration of the Holy Ghost throughout all the ages, it shares the two-fold nature of Jesus Christ. It is divine. The Son of God is

the Head, the life, the indwelling power of the Church. It is human. The humanity of Christ is the everlasting medium of God approaching, embracing, blessing, and communing with, mankind in all places and in every age. The humanity of Christ is the abiding medium of communion on the part of men with Christ by faith, and in Christ of communion with God. As divine and human, it possesses objective being; not the result of intellectual reflection, or of the social instincts of men; not merely an external organization established and continued by converted persons according to certain general abstract principles taught in the Bible; but an organic constitution of the Spirit developing, perpetuating and extending itself according to the law of life in Christ Jesus. As divine the Church is supernatural; it is above man, and above nature, as to its origin, being, law and power. As human it is natural; the form of its supernatural being in the history of the world is determined by the constitution of human life, and human society. This is a mystery. We can not comprehend nor analyse logically the kingdom of Heaven on earth, as little as we can comprehend and analyse the Person of Christ. As He is, so is the Bride of the Lamb; of supernatural being and power in the likeness of sinful flesh; (Rom. 8: 3.) the object of faith; the abode of the Holy Ghost; the unailing channel of divine grace; the pillar and ground of revealed truth; (1 Tim. 2: 15) the Ark of safety for a despairing world; the home of the weary and heavy laden; in whose communion there is living fellowship with God in Christ, with holy angels, prophets, apostles, martyrs, and all saints. This living fellowship with Jesus Christ by the Holy Ghost in the Church satisfies the ruling desire of all nations. For this the crushed heart of mankind yearns unknowingly with irrepressible longings. Of this all mythologies, all sacrifices, rites and ceremonies, prayers and mortifications of the body, utter a dark prophecy. And towards this concrete reconciliation of the Infinite and the Finite, metaphysical speculation has struggled in agonizing

thought from Thales down though all the centuries to Mansel. Here there is truth and peace for the race.

The religions of the world differ from Christianity in every particular that has now been unfolded. These distinctive characteristics can be found in no system which has grown up on the soil of the human heart.

E. V. G.

ART. VI.—WHAT IS A CATECHUMEN?

What is a Catechumen? A right answer to this question is of the highest importance. It is necessary to the Catechumen; for without this he can not rightly understand his position, his duties, and his privileges. It is necessary to the catechist; that he may know the precise nature of his office and work. It is also necessary to a proper understanding of the nature of a catechism, and for determining what ought to be its character.

What, in the true sense of the word, is a Catechumen?

A Catechumen is one in course of instruction and nurture for full communion in the church. From the very nature and position of Christianity, as it exists and operates in the world, it may at once be seen that there must be two classes or kinds of Catechumens.

First, those who are the subjects of the Church's aggressive activities—of its extensive or missionary operations. This class of Catechumens are composed of adult heathen, or such as have grown up in an unchristian way in Christian lands, but who nevertheless manifest an inclination towards Christianity, and are willing to be instructed in regard to its nature and claims, as yet unbaptized, but candidates for baptism, and in a course of preparation for the reception of that sacrament.

The other class is constituted of such as are the subjects

of the intensive or inner mission of the Church—such as have been born of Christian parents, baptized in their infancy, are growing up in the bosom of the Church, and are to be nurtured and educated for its full communion, in order that they may become self-conscious and ripe Christians.

Baptism is the fundamental point which divides these two classes. In the one case this sacrament having gone before, while in the other it is still to follow. It is the want or the possession of this, that gives them a distinct character, places them in different positions, and requires for them a peculiar treatment.

As to their character, the first class are disciples, or learners, and candidates for Christianity; as to their position, they are outside of the Church, but subjects of its influence and care; as to their treatment, it is not that which proceeds upon the supposition of their Christian character, but is preparatory to it. It is the catechumenate *unto* baptism; and holds a similar relation to Christianity as the mission of John the Baptist did to that of Christ.

The second class, as to their character, are Christian; as to their position, they are in the Church; and their treatment is such as belongs, not to candidates for the Church, but to candidates in its bosom, preparing for full communion, and the full development of the Christian life in them.

In our Saviour's commission to His disciples we have these two classes indicated, with the mention of their treatment before and after baptism. "All power is given unto me in heaven and in earth. Go ye therefore and teach (*μαθητεύσατε*, make disciples of) all nations, baptizing them in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost; teaching (*διδάσκοντες*) them to observe all things whatsoever I have commanded you: and lo, I am with you alway even unto the end of the world." (Matth. 28: 18-20.) Thus a certain measure and kind of instruction was to precede baptism—which completing itself in baptism constituted the making of disciples—whilst the rest was to fol-

low after it, that the discipleship might complete itself in the full state and standing of the Christian life. Some things were to be taught them in order to make them disciples prepared for baptism, and afterwards they were to be taught "to observe *all things*" that belong to the full Christian life. "At the beginning," says Dr. Neander, "those (among the Jews) who confessed their belief in *Jesus* as the *Messiah*, or, (among the gentiles) their belief in one God, and in *Jesus* as the *Messiah*, were, as appears from the New Testament, immediately baptized."* "Confession of penitence and profession of faith in Christ as Saviour," says Gerlach, "even when this was not as yet connected with a clear consciousness of His person and doctrines, the apostles regarded as sufficient to admit to baptism." This is very evident from the examples, Acts 2: 41; 8: 12, 37; 9: 19; 10: 47, 48; 16: 33; 19: 5.

Having distinguished the two classes of catechumens, it will be necessary to a full view of the subject, to treat of both successively in a somewhat historical way. As the work of the Church at the beginning was necessarily rather extensive than intensive, more a work of foreign aggressive missions than of domestic inner missions, the Catechumens, of which mention is made in the primitive Church, were mostly of the first class.

Though not yet baptized, these Catechumens were regarded as in some measure within the pale of the Church, under its care and grace, candidates for heaven, and as such the name of Christians was allowed to them. "They were not yet sons," says St. Augustine, "but servants; they belonged to the house of God, but were not yet admitted to all the privileges of it; being only Christians at large, and not in the most strict and proper acceptation."† Being under the influence of the word, they were properly regarded as "imperfect Christians," for the Scriptures attribute regenerating power also to the word as an agency or factor, working toward the birth which becomes ultimately com-

* Church History Vol. I, p. 422. London. 1855.

† Bingham's Christ. Antiq. Vol. I, p. 10.

plete by water and the Spirit. 1 Peter 1: 23. Luke 8: 4, 11, 15. 1 John 9. James 1: 18. 1 Cor. 4: 15. Gal. 3: 2. Rom. 10: 17.

It was felt in the case of these catechumens, that besides their willingness to be taught, a gracious basis in them was necessary to insure the blessing of God to these instructions. Hence they were raised to a position of special consecration, having been solemnly set apart as catechumens by the laying on of hands and prayer.†

Heathen children might be admitted as Catechumens even before they were seven years of age, though in most cases they were of course much older. They were taken at any age, whenever they manifested a willingness to forsake heathenism and become Christians. The period during which they remained Catechumens previous to baptism varied according to circumstances and the sincerity and progress apparent in the Catechumen. In the apostolic age it was very short. The extraordinary character of that age, the fresh miraculous power which accompanied the preaching of the apostles, and the consequent almost momentary full decision of the converts, made it proper for them to be baptized immediately on their receiving the testimony of Jesus. This may be seen in the case of Cornelius, of the Ethiopian Eunuch, of Lydia, and the jailer of Philippi. "But in after ages," as Bingham well remarks, "the Church found it necessary to lengthen this term of probation, lest an over-hasty admission of persons to baptism, should either fill the church with vicious men, or make greater number of renegadoes and apostates in time of persecution." Thus after apostolic times the period of instruction and trial varied, as already stated, according to circumstances, from eight days to three years. In cases of sickness the Catechumen was immediately baptized.

The Catechumens, during the period of their instruction and probation, were the objects of the tenderest care and pious affection of the congregation to which they belonged. When that part of the service which had direct reference

† See the proof at large in Bingham's *Christ. Antiq.* Vol. I, p. 429, 430.

to them began, a deacon, from some eminency in the church cried: "Pray, ye Catechumens:" and, "Let all the faithful with attention pray for them, saying: Lord have mercy upon them." Then the deacon began a prayer for them, which being both an exhortation to prayer, and a direction how they were to pray, was called "a bidding prayer for the Catechumens." Two forms of this ancient prayer are still extant, one in St. Chrysostom, and another in the Apostolic Constitutions.

As showing the mind of the Church toward the Catechumens, we give the one from the Constitutions as quoted by Bingham. It is in these beautiful and touching words: "Let us all beseech God for the Catechumens; that He, who is gracious, and a lover of mankind, would mercifully hearken to their supplications and prayers, and, accepting their petitions, would help them, and grant them the requests of their souls according to what is expedient for them; that He would reveal the Gospel of Christ to them; that He would enlighten and instruct them, and teach them the knowledge of God and Divine things; that He would instruct them in His precepts and judgments; that He would open the ears of their hearts to be occupied in His law day and night; that He would confirm them in religion; that He would unite them to, and number them with His holy flock, vouchsafing them the laver of regeneration, with the garment of incorruption, and true life; that He would deliver them from all impiety, and give no place to the adversary to get advantage against them; but that He would cleanse them from all pollution of flesh and spirit, and dwell in them, and walk in them by His Christ; that He would bless their going out, and their coming in, and direct all their designs and purposes to their advantage. Further yet, let us earnestly pray for them, that they may have remission of sins by the initiation of baptism, and be thought worthy of the holy mysteries and remain among his saints."

Then the deacon also addressed the Catechumens, saying: "Catechumens, arise. Pray for the peace of God,

that this day, and all the time of your life, may pass in quietness, and without sin; that you may make a Christian end, and find God propitious and merciful, and obtain remissions of your sins. Commend yourselves to the only unbegotten God by His Christ." The people and especially children, were directed to add to each petition of this "bidding prayer," by way of response: "Lord have mercy upon them." These prayers over, the deacon bids the Catechumens bow down and receive the benediction of the bishop: in these words:

"O Almighty God, who art without original and inaccessible, the only true God, Thou God and Father of Christ Thy only begotten Son, God of the Comforter, and Lord of all things; who by Christ didst make learners become teachers for the propagation of Christian knowledge; look down now upon these Thy Servants, who are learning the instructions of the Gospel of Thy Christ and give them a new heart, and renew a right Spirit within them, that they may know and do Thy will with a perfect heart, and a willing mind. Vouchsafe them Thy holy baptism, and unite them to Thy holy Church, and make them partakers of Thy holy mysteries, through Christ our hope, who died for them, by whom be glory and worship unto Thee, world without end." In response to which all the congregation with a loud voice cry out, "Amen." After this the deacon says: "Catechumens, depart in peace."

From this we may see what a tender mother the Church made herself to the Catechumens who were looking forward to full introduction and rest in her bosom, reaching forth her arms of love toward them, and by her instructions, making herself a school-master to lead them to Christ.

Owing to the position of this class of Catechumens, being as yet unbaptized, the whole character of the instructions which they received differed from that which is proper to baptized children in the church, as the preaching and baptism of John differed from that of Christ and His apostles. It rested on a different basis, started from a different point, and tended immediately to a different end.

It was not in questions and answers but in a continued discourse. This is significant. Not being baptized, and not having therefore received the Holy Ghost as a divine and gracious basis in them (Acts 2: 38; 8: 14; 10: 57.) the divine life could not as yet be evoked from them and nurtured as the life of new-born children, so that the church could call them to respond to its faith in the way of confession, and thus learn, as from a mothers lips, to pronounce the true faith, and make subjective confession to salvation. They must be led to the faith, rather than answer in it. They were not yet in the Church and one with it so that they could utter its faith as from its bosom; but the Church was seeking to enter them in such way as it could previous to baptism, in order that thus ultimately they might be brought into its bosom. Hence she speaks to them that which they can hear and obey, but which they can not yet utter as their own.

This accords with and explains another feature of the ancient mission Catechization. It did not include instruction on any point which belongs properly after baptism, or which belongs to the subjective mysteries of faith and the Christian life. On the contrary these, as the Eucharist, the mode of baptism and confirmation, the Creed, Lord's Prayer, and some other parts of faith and worship, were studiously kept away from them till near the time of their baptism or immediately after it. The Catechization was objective and historical. The catechist gave a sketch of the history of redemption, with a view of establishing and confirming the Catechumen in the verity of the Christian faith. This is plain from the Treatise of St. Augustine on "The Catechizing of the Unlearned." He instructs the Catechist how to give the narration of the facts of revelation, teaching him to give it either shorter, or longer and more full, as the case may require. "The Narration is full, when each is at first Catechized from that which is written; *In the beginning God created the heaven and the earth,* down to the present times of the Church. It does not, however, follow that we ought either, if we have learned the

whole Pentateuch, the whole of the books of Judges and Kings and Esdras, and the whole of the Gospel and of the Acts of the Apostles, to repeat them by memory, or by narrating in our own words all things which are contained in these volumes, to put them forth and expound them. Which neither the time allows of, nor does any necessity demand it of us, but to embrace all things summarily and generally, in such a way as to select some certain of a more wonderful character, which are listened to with more pleasure, and which were set in the turning period in such wise, as that it is not fitting to shew them, as it were, wrapped up, and straightway to hurry them out of sight, but by delaying on them somewhat as it were to open and unfold them, and to hold them forth as objects for the minds of our hearers to inspect and admire; but for the rest, rapidly running them over to insert and weave them into the narration. So both those things, which we wish to be especially urged upon the attention, stand forth the more from the others being kept back, and he whose interest we are wishing by our narration to excite, does not come to them with feelings of weariness, nor again do we render confused his memory whom by our teaching we ought to instruct."*

From this extract the historical character of this kind of Catechization is clearly seen. In his specimen Catechetical address from which we have just quoted, St. Augustine begins by showing the unsubstantial and unsatisfying nature of all earthly good, and of the peace and rest to be found in Christianity. Then he goes through the historical narration from the beginning down to his time; after which he concludes with an earnest exhortation to them to flee to the refuge, and establish themselves firmly in the faith which brings salvation. From the narrative part are unfolded also, in passing, the great facts and principles in the divine scheme of salvation.

St. Augustine's system also involves a good deal of

* St. Augustine's short Treatises p. 191.

apologetics and even polemics. This is consistent in mission Catechization, and was necessary for proselytes, to take away from them their remaining errors, and to fortify them against pagan views, by which they were surrounded—"against Gentiles, or Jews, or Heretics."

Besides what we learn of the method and substance of this kind of Catechization from the Treatise of St. Augustine, we have the several heads of instruction prescribed by the author of the Apostolical Constitutions: "Let the Catechumen be taught before baptism the knowledge of the Father unbegotten, the knowledge of His only begotten Son, and Holy Spirit; let him learn the order of the worlds creation, and series of Divine providence, and the different sorts of legislation; let him be taught, why the world, and man, the citizen of the world, were made; let him be instructed about his own nature, to understand for what end he himself was made; let him be informed how God punished the wicked with water and fire, and crowned his saints with glory in every generation, viz: Seth, Enos, Enoch, Noah, Abraham and his posterity, Melchisedeck, Job, Moses, Joshua, Caleb, and Phineas the priest, and the saints of every age; let him also be taught, how the providence of God never forsook mankind, but called them at sundry times, from error and vanity to the knowledge of the truth, reducing them from slavery and impiety to liberty and godliness, from iniquity to righteousness, and from everlasting death to eternal life. After these, he must learn the doctrine of Christ's incarnation, his passion, his resurrection, and assumption; and what it is to renounce the devil, and enter into covenant with Christ."

These directions also indicate that these instructions pertained prevailingly to the outward historical matters of Christianity, the object of which was to prepare them for faith and grace which were not presupposed in them, as in the case of Catechumens in the Church, but to which they were to be guided and led. They were also, as Bingham remarks, encouraged to read the Scriptures, but only portions of them; "for the moral and historical books were thought most proper at first for their instruction."

Thus by the character of the instructions which the Catechumens received, there is indicated, in a profound and significant manner, the position which they were regarded as holding. We see at the same time the fundamental difference between Catechumens before baptism and Catechumens after baptism, and the difference of treatment severally due and proper to these two classes.

As we have seen, the circumstances of Christianity in the early ages of the Church, when it was in the process of being introduced into heathen nations, made it necessary that catechizing should be missionary in its character, and that consequently the Catechumens should be such as were candidates for baptism, and who, by this means were to be prepared for that ordinance. We find, however, that from the earliest times, and ever more and more, as, through infant baptism, entire families became Christian, the work of inner missions grew in importance, and became of necessity the surest and most effectual mode, not only of firmly establishing, but also permanently extending, Christianity. This is the catechumenate of the baptized, by which, agreeable to the apostolic commission, those who had been "made disciples" by baptism were taught "to observe all things" which Christ had commanded. (Math. 28: 18-20.)

Church history speaks less of this class of Catechumens than of the other; for which there is no doubt this reason, that it belonged more to the internal regular and silent operations of the Church. It was carried forward in the bosom of Christian families by parents themselves, rather than by a distinct class of official catechists; for it lies in the nature of the divine constitution of the family that parents should be the first instructors of their children; and hence to them is given the divine and apostolic command to "bring them up in the nurture and admonition of the Lord." (Eph. 6: 4.)

Whilst it was thus made the duty of Christian parents to be the first catechists to their children, and whilst "the Church in the house" was constituted the first nursery of

piety and religious knowledge to baptized infant Christians, it is equally evident that the Church did not leave its families unsupported in this work, but came to their assistance as these infant members advanced to an age when they were capable of sharing in a fuller communion with the Church. "As for the children of believing parents, it is certain, that as they were baptized in infancy, so they were admitted Catechumens as soon as they were capable of learning."* To the same effect is the testimony of Calvin: "It was an ancient custom in the Church for the children of Christians, after they were come to years of discretion, to be presented to the bishop in order to fulfil that duty which was required of adults who offered themselves to baptism. For such persons were placed among the Catechumens, till, being duly instructed in the mysteries of Christianity, they were enabled to make a confession of their faith (in their confirmation) before the bishop and all the people. Therefore those who had been baptized in their infancy, because they had not then made such a confession of faith before the Church, at the close of childhood, or the commencement of adolescence, were again presented by their parents, and were examined by the bishop according to the form of the Catechism which was then in common use."† Then they were received into full communion with the Church by the laying on of hands—the rite of confirmation, evident traces or germs of which are found in the Acts of the Apostles, and in the Epistles of the New Testament. This system of catechization was fully restored in the Reformation.

We have already shown that an unbaptized person is not a Catechumen in the full sense and best meaning of that term. This position belongs only to one baptized, who by virtue of his baptism is the subject of the Church's inner missionary work, by which he is to be carried forward to full self-conscious Christian life and full communion with the Church. Thus it will appear that in order to have a correct view of the catechumenate two things are necessary

* Bingham's *Christ. Antiq.* Vol. I. p. 431.

† Calvin's *Institutes*. Book iv. Chap. xix. iv.

to be understood: 1. The relation of the catechumen *back* to his Baptism, and 2. His relation *forward* to confirmation and full communion with the Church in the Lord's Supper.

What has the Catechumen received in baptism, and what is he made more because he has been a subject of that sacrament than he would have been without it? To this question various answers are given. With these we have at present no concern. We confine ourselves to the answer which is given to the question by the Reformed Church.

1. The catechetical system of the Reformed Church regards the baptized catechumen as in a position entirely different from that occupied by the unbaptized. The evidence of this is furnished in the Heidelberg Catechism itself. In the 74th question we are taught that infants must by baptism "be distinguished from the children of infidels" or unbelievers, "as was done in the Old Testament by circumcision, instead of which baptism is instituted in the new covenant." There was every difference between those who were circumcised and those who were not. The first were the people of God, the last were not. The circumcised might grow up unworthy of such relation, neglect or reject this advantage and thus be cast off by God; but it was their privilege to retain their position, and grow up in all its gracious advantages. The same position and advantage belongs to baptized persons; and whilst they retain these they are "distinguished from the children of unbelievers," as the children of God are distinguished from those who are not his children.

2. Baptized Catechumens are members of the Church. This the Heidelberg Catechism also teaches in the 74th question, where we are taught that infants must "by baptism, as a sign of the covenant, be incorporated* into the Christian Church." As the Church is the body of Christ those who are in it as members, are also so far members of Christ who is its head. In Question 54 which speaks of the church, the catechumen is taught to profess, and be-

* See the original German: "So sollen sie auch durch die Taufe, als des Bundeszeichen, der Christlichen Kirche einverleibet werden," Quæ. 74.

lieve, and say in regard to it: "That I am, and forever shall remain, a living member thereof."

As circumcision made the subject of it one with the body of God's people, so baptism introduces the subject of it into the body of the Church. This is evident from many passages of Scripture. In connection with the scene on the day of Pentecost appears the fact that: "Then they that gladly received his word, were baptized: and the same day *there were added* unto them about three thousand souls." (Acts 2: 41.) Paul testifies: "For by one Spirit are we all baptized into one body." (1. Cor. 12: 13.) Thus baptism is a birth into the Church.

3. Baptized Catechumens are by the Reformed Church regarded as Christians. Hence throughout the Catechism they are addressed as Christians; and in the 32d question they are directly so called: and taught to profess themselves "members of Christ," and partakers of His anointing to the offices of Prophet Priest and King. Throughout the entire catechism they are taught to regard themselves as Christians, and to answer and profess as such. As Christians they sustain a relation to Christ which they did not sustain before. "For as many of you as have been baptized into Christ, have put on Christ." (Gal. 3: 27.) This certainly does not mean that those who are baptized are still, as before, out of Christ and children of the devil.

Though the baptized Catechumen is thus in a position different from the unbaptized, a member of the Church, and a Christian, the question still presses on us, What gracious advantages does this give him, or what is he more and better with these than without them? What is his baptism to him, and how much is included in his bearing the name Christian, as regards his Christian life, and his ultimate salvation? This we answer by an additional proposition—

4. The baptized Catechumen is in grace.

By this is not meant that grace is developed in the baptized, but merely that it has obtained a beginning. He is in a position and state of grace in which he does not al-

ways grow to the full maturity of salvation because the conditions of such growth are not always brought to bear upon his development, but in which *he may* grow, and in which he will grow if the necessary means appointed and provided for his growth are not neglected by him or those having care over him. From his baptism he is to "grow in grace"—according to the Apostle's word (2 Peter 3: 18)—rather than *into* it, even as a tree grows in the soil, into which it has been transplanted.

That this is the position and state of the baptized Catechumen is evident from a consideration of the several gifts which the holy Scriptures connect with baptism, and set forth as the fruits of it.

1. We have already seen that by baptism they become members of the Church. The Church is represented in the Scriptures, not merely as a receptacle for Christians, but as a *basis* and *soil* of grace. By baptism we are translated from the soil of nature into the soil of grace—from the world into the Church. This the apostle Paul sets forth in a clear and strong light, (Rom. 6: 3-11) by comparing it to two things:

First to *burial* and *rising*. "Know ye not that so many of us as were baptized into Jesus Christ"—baptized *into* Him, not baptized *because we were already in Him*, as one view of baptism would have it, nor yet baptized *that we may in future be brought into union with Him*, as another view teaches—"were baptized into His death?" "Therefore"—because we are baptized—"we are buried with Him by baptism into death"—that is into the death of sin—"that like as Christ was raised up from the dead by the glory of the Father, even so we also should walk in *newness of life*." As Christ went down into death and rose from it, so in baptism we have the transition point between the death of the old nature and the life of the new. There sin begins to die, and there grace begins to live, in us. This same sense is still farther brought out and illustrated by the second representation of the Apostle,

By a *planting* and *growing* together with Christ. "For

if we have been planted together in the likeness of His death, we shall be also in the likeness of His resurrection." The allusion is, according to some, to the planting of a seed in the soil. The seed will never grow unless it is planted; so no one can grow in grace till he is baptized. In the planting it receives a position and state in a soil where, with the proper conditions present, the death of the old seed and the growth of the new plant will immediately begin; so in baptism begins the death of the old nature of sin, and the new life of grace. The soil into which we are planted is the Church—the planting is baptism—and in it is the turning between the old and the new life.—According to others the allusion is to grafting. The bringing together of the graft and the tree in which it is placed, is the beginning of the new growth. According to this figure we or our humanity is the bad tree to which Christ unites Himself. Baptism is His act to us, in which we "put on Christ." Thus the mystery which is seen in grafting—in which the good graft on the bad scion, has the power of annulling the life of the stem to which it has been united and on which it grows, back into its roots, whilst the nature of the whole stem is changed by the graft—is beautifully significant. The second Adam, as the source of a renovating humanity, joins himself to our bad nature in baptism as a good and fruitful graft to a bad stem, and by virtue of that union, the new graft acts back on the old stem, overcoming and annulling its old and evil nature, and making our fallen and depraved life the recipient, and at the same time the bearer, of a new and heavenly life, thus changing its nature.

It appears at first view strange that a grafted tree should bear the fruit of the graft, and not of the original stem; since the stem is first in the order of life, forming the basis of the graft, the source and medium of its life and growth. But science explains the seeming mystery. The root of the tree, pushing downward absorbs from the soil the food of the plant, but *only in a crude form*. It is afterwards carried up through the stem into the leaves, where

it is digested and assimilated, and only then carried back to enter into stem and root for the growth of new rootlets, branches and leaves, as well as to feed and increase those already existing. The leaves are the lungs of the plant in which its sap is changed by contact with air and light, in the same way as the blood, or that which is to become vital blood, is changed by the lungs of the human body. It is only after this change—in which there is the decomposition of water and carbonic acid, and the discharge of superfluous moisture, by which it is condensed and changed into organizable matter—that what was crude food enters as vitalizing food into every part of the plant. If the leaves be taken away repeatedly, not only will the tree remain fruitless, but its life will be destroyed. Thus it is, after all, the leaves growing on the graft which rule the nature of the tree's life. How deep and beautiful is the illustration thus furnished of the relation of Christ's new humanity to the old humanity corrupted and fallen in Adam; and of His uniting Himself to our bad nature to vivify and sanctify it by His holy humanity.

Having given us these clear and beautiful illustrations of baptism as the turning point between the old life of nature and the new life of grace, he proceeds in the most nervous language, to exhort those who occupy this position and this gracious advantage, not to receive this grace in vain, but to be earnest in its development to full salvation, of which it is not the end but the beginning. "Knowing this, that our old man is crucified with Him, that the body of sin *might be destroyed*, that *henceforth* we should not serve sin. For he that is dead is *freed from sin*. Now, if we be *dead* with Christ, we believe that we shall also *live* with him: knowing that Christ, being raised from the dead, dieth no more, death hath no more dominion over him. For in that he *died*, he died unto sin once; but in that he *liveth*, he liveth unto God. *Likewise reckon ye also yourselves to be dead indeed unto sin, but alive unto God through Jesus Christ our Lord.*" Let not sin therefore reign in your mortal body, that ye should obey it in the lusts thereof.

Neither yield ye your members as instruments of unrighteousness unto sin; but yield yourselves unto God, *as those that are alive from the dead*, and your members as instruments of righteousness unto God; for sin shall not have dominion over you: *for ye are not under the law, but under grace.*"

All this is in substance the same as the exhortation which Maurice put into the mouth of Luther, as expressing the views of that Reformer on the point in hand: "Believe on the warrent of your Baptism, you are grafted into Christ; claim your position. You have the Spirit, you are children of God; do not live as if you belonged to the devil."* "We conclude, therefore," says Calvin, "that we are baptized into the mortification of the flesh, which commences in us at baptism, which we are to pursue from day to day, and which will be perfected when we pass out of this life."

Accordant with this view of the Church as a soil of grace into which holy baptism plants us, are all the representations given us of the Church by Christ and his apostles. It is always compared to something that is life-bearing, and life-cultivating. It is a garden, a vineyard, a field, a mother. The beginning of the life of grace in the Church is always from a small and hidden beginning, as the mustard "which indeed is the *least* of all seeds"—the leaven which "a woman took and *hid*" in meal—as the "new-born babe," which is *incapable of nourishing itself*, but which must *receive the nourishment* from the mother who bare it, and that of the most delicate kind.

The grace which is made to underlie those who are planted into the church, and their silent, gradual growth from this point on to the full perfection of the Christian life, is beautifully set forth by our Saviour in one of His admirable parables: "So is the kingdom of God, as if a man should cast *seed into the ground*; and should sleep, and rise night and day, and the *seed should spring and grow up*, he knoweth not *how*. For the earth bringeth forth fruit of

* The kingdom of Christ, by Frederick Denison Maurice, A. M. p. 255.

herself; first the blade, then the ear after that the full corn in the ear. But when the fruit is brought forth, immediately he putteth in the sickle, because the harvest is come." (Mark 4: 26-29.)

We may further see that Baptism brings the Catechumen into a state of grace from the fact that with Baptism is connected the remission of sin. "Repent, and be baptized every one of you in the name of Jesus Christ, *for the remission of sins.*" Acts 2: 38. See also 22: 16. Let it not be said that this applies only to adults, because it was spoken to them, and because repentance was required to precede Baptism; for it is distinctly added "*the promise is to you, and your children.*" It must have the same virtue in the case of infants where, because there is no actual sin, repentance is not needed. If it be granted that in the case of adults it secures the remission of sin, it must also be granted that in them it does not at once entirely remove natural depravity, for that remains though not with the same power; so in infants their original evil nature is not at once wholly taken away, while nevertheless the basis and beginning of grace is effected in it, from which principle and point forward it possesses a gracious advantage by which, in the same way as the baptized adult, a new life of grace is initiated, and may be carried forward by regular growth to full salvation.

Against the plain teachings of the Scriptures on this point, it is sometimes denied that remission of sins is given in baptism on the ground that Simon the sorcerer, though baptized, was still "in the gall of bitterness, and in the bonds of iniquity." (Acts 8: 23.) But this objection is at once set aside by the consideration that, as an adult, a proper preparation for the reception of baptism was necessary which in his case was not at hand. His motives were wrong. He expected gain, and offered money for the gift of God; therefore the apostle Peter said to him: "Thou hast neither part nor lot in this matter: for thine heart is not right in the sight of God." No such hindrance to the grace of baptism exists in the case of infants, nor yet of adults, who have sincerely repented and who truly believe.

We must also remember that the virtue of Baptism is not confined to the time when it takes place. The covenant of which it is the sign and seal abides for all future time. As it is administered only once, and not to be repeated, its efficacy for the remission is permanent. It is always the basis on which the remission of sin may be newly obtained. On this point Calvin has forcibly said: "Nor must it be supposed that baptism is administered only for the time past, so that for sins into which we fall after baptism it would be necessary to seek other new remedies of expiation in I know not what other sacraments, as if the virtue of baptism were become obsolete. In consequence of this error, it happened, in former ages, that some persons would not be baptized except at the close of their life, and almost in the moment of their death, that so they might obtain pardon for their whole life—a preposterous caution, which is frequently censured in the writing of the ancient bishops. But we ought to conclude, that at whatever time we are baptized, we are washed and purified for the whole of life. Whenever we have fallen, therefore, we must recur to the remembrance of baptism, and arm our minds with the consideration of it, that we may be always certified and assured of the remission of our sins. For though, when it has been once administered, it appears to be past, yet it is not abolished by subsequent sins. For the purity of Christ is offered to us in it; and that always retains its virtue, is never overcome by any blemishes, but purifies and obliterates all our defilements."

"I know," says Calvin further, "the common opinion is, that remission of sins, which at our first regeneration we receive by baptism alone, is afterwards obtained by repentance and the benefit of the keys. But the advocates of this opinion have fallen into an error, for want of considering that the power of the keys, of which they speak, is so dependant on baptism that it cannot by any means be separated from it." Again he says, "If repentance be enjoined upon us as long as we live, the virtue of baptism ought to be extended to the same period. Wherefore it is

evident that the pious, whenever, in any part of their lives, they are distressed with a consciousness of their sins, may justly have recourse to the remembrance of baptism, in order to confirm themselves in the confidence of their interest in that one perpetual ablution which is enjoyed in the blood of Christ."*

Thus all proper repentance of a baptized person is a return to his baptism, as the sure covenant ground on which he may confidently sue for pardon. He may forget the sure foundation, wander from it, act and live unworthy of it, but the covenant with its grace is ever there as the strong arms of everlasting love beneath and around him upon which he may ever fall back for pardon and peace.

8. As Christ in baptism gives the remission of sin, so He gives in it also the grace necessary for the new life. This great grace is all included in the gift of the Holy Ghost, which is also given in Baptism. That the Holy Ghost is given upon baptism, is so evident from many examples in the Acts of the Apostles that it is only necessary to refer to the fact. Peter assures the enquirer on the day of Pentecost that in addition to the remission of sins they shall receive the gift of the Holy Ghost," on their penitent submission to baptism. Our Saviour had before taught Nicodemus that the birth of water and of the Spirit go together. (John 3: 5). Paul to Titus declares that "according to his mercy he saved us, by the washing of regeneration, and the renewing of the Holy Ghost." (Tit. 3. 5.)

The Holy Ghost thus given in baptism, takes up His abode in the covenanted soul, and is united to the soul as He is not to one in the world. This is the great burden of our blessed Saviour's promise to His disciples, "I will pray the Father, and he shall give you another Comforter, that he may abide with you forever; even the Spirit of truth whom the world cannot receive, because it seeth him not, neither knoweth him; but ye know him; for he dwelleth with you, and shall be in you." (John 14: 16. 17.) In like

* Calvin's Institutes, Book iv, Chap. xv. See III. iv.

manner also does St. Paul speak: "Know ye not that ye are the temple of God, and that the Spirit of God dwelleth in you." (1 Cor. 3: 16.)

This deep truth is beautifully recognized by the Heidelberg Catechism, affirming that we "become more and more united to His sacred body by the Holy Ghost, who dwells *both in Christ and in us*,"* thus becoming the bond of union and communion between Him and us.

As the Holy Ghost is thus given upon baptism, and as He sustains afterwards a new relation to the covenanted person which He did not sustain to him before, and does not sustain to the world, several inferences must legitimately be drawn from this fact.

1. That the Holy Ghost from that point on begins an inward work with the soul of the baptized subject. The outward act of baptism becomes a truly inward power by His indwelling and inworking. He unites himself with the human spirit in its most inward life, deeper than the baptized one's own spiritual activities—for He is the greater of the two. Thus the very life of Jesus Christ, whose Spirit the Holy Spirit is, and in whom He dwells as he does also at the same time in the subject, is, by the power of the Holy Ghost, made over to the Spirit of the baptized, by which wonderful mystery, the equally wonderful mystery of regeneration has its foundation and beginning. "Ye are not in the flesh, but in the Spirit, if so be that the Spirit of God dwell in you." (Rom. 8: 9.) Let it however always be remembered that this is only the beginning of a new life, not its completion and end. Even the grace of Baptism may be received in vain. The possibility must go forward to actuality. The planting must go forward in the growth. The birth of which our Saviour speaks to Nicodemus is not of water or baptism *alone*, but of water *and* the Spirit. The "washing of regeneration" must connect itself with "the renewing of the Holy Ghost." Hence the warnings against grieving, quenching, striving against, and doing despite to the Spirit. Hence the warn-

* Question 16.

ing against the loss of this grace. (Heb. 6: 4. 10: 29.)

2. We can see that there is here a true basis of grace in the soul. Is regeneration necessary as the basis of grace, from which point alone true growth in the divine life can begin, the Holy Spirit by whose presence, energy, and work, positive regeneration is effected, has secured, as we have seen, a subjective union of Himself with the spirit of the baptized. That He must enter the spirit for its regeneration is granted by all, in all conceptions of this work, and under every system of practical theology. This is granted even by such as entirely separate regeneration from baptism. If then the Holy Ghost must unite Himself with the spirit of man for its regeneration, why not at the time of baptism? Why not in and through that act? Especially when the sacred Scriptures habitually connect the gift of the Holy Ghost and consequent regeneration with Baptism. John 3: 5. Acts 2: 38. Tit. 3: 5. It is professed that the Spirit may be given for the purposes of regeneration in answer to prayer in the closet, or at what is commonly called the "anxious-seat" at the altar of the church; why not, therefore, in that ordinance which God has himself instituted, and with which, as "the washing of regeneration," He has so plainly connected it in His word? If even we hold the sacrament of baptism as merely the figure or representation of regeneration, why may we not, at least as readily, believe that the grace is given *with* it, as sundered *from* it.

In addition to this we ought not to forget that while prayer, in connection with which it is professed that the gift of the Holy Ghost and regeneration are given, is *our act to God*, whilst the sacrament of baptism is *God's act to us*; and hence it may be asked, is not regeneration God's act—something which He does to us—and may not the subject of baptism, or his parents, with the very best reason, by prayer at the time, claim the grace of this divine act? Or is God indeed a formalist, and His sacrament an empty form, with which He is not willing to connect the grace which that form covers and represents? Is he a

formalist, and does his faith tend to formalism, who holds that the outward act of baptism really covers and reveals the inward grace? Or is not rather he a formalist who, while he retains and outwardly honors the form by observing it, at the same time in his faith sunders the two? Thus leaving the form stand alone, while he expects the grace at another time and in another way.

3. If the Holy Ghost is thus given in Baptism, sustaining thenceforth a new inward relation to the baptized subject in which the basis and beginning of regeneration is effected, then the basis for the new life may be thus effected as well in infants as in adult subjects. Regeneration is effected by a divine act; and as such it finds even less hindrance in the infant than in the adult. Though all things are easy with God, yet it is agreeable to the spirit of divine teachings, and accordant with all experience and right reflection, to conceive that the Holy Ghost should at least as readily unite Himself with a soul in which evil is as yet latent, and in which the stiff bias of evil habit and actual sin does not yet exist, as He should effect such an union with a soul in which the natural life of sin is in a degree developed and firmly set. In the case of infants His new-forming energies would exert themselves on a far more pliable nature; and thus, humanly speaking, with less difficulty lay deep in the soul, and beneath its active moral energies and activities, the beginnings of a renovated and renovating life.

A more favorable and hopeful subject for the beginnings of grace certainly is the one that does *not yet believe*, as in the case of the infant, than the one who is *unbelieving*, as the adult heathen, or the adult natural man in a Christian land. The child is as yet *not-christian* but by no means as yet actively and positively *un-christian*, or *anti-christian*. It possesses merely a germ-like undeveloped individuality; and has not come to wilful, intelligent, and self-conscious evil. Is it not honoring the wisdom of God to regard this as the point and period of its life where, and when, He would begin the work of its renovation; and that hence

the instituted ordinances and helps to this new life are adapted to this state and for this end?

The deepest moral principle of the human spirit is the WILL. If now the Holy Spirit unites Himself with the spirit before the will has come to put forth free conscious self-determining activities, thus underlieing its plastic powers while they still slumber in latent possibility, is there not furnished in this fact a basis sufficiently deep and early for a new life; and may we not believe that the spiritual life of the child may, from that point on, be nurtured and carried forward to the full stature of self-conscious character without any violent technical change, reaching the full Christian life and character by development from the beginning lying in baptism and the gift of the Holy Ghost which goes with it, rather than by transition after baptism.

We must further call to mind that the baptized child is at the same time in the Church—the objective factor, which works from without on the child, even as the mother which has given birth to the child nurses and nourishes it. The Holy Spirit, moreover, who, as we have seen, is in the child, is also in the Church, working in upon the child's spirit, as well as from within out. In other words, it is the subject of the Church's educational activities; and these are two-fold: *nurture*, by which the grace of baptism is unfolded, or called forth, and *discipline*, by which the powers of its evil nature are repressed, and its evil tendencies hindered, so that the motions of evil are kept to their weakest workings. (Eph. 6: 4.) This is done in the Church, and in the family and school included in the Church; in each of which is found this double power, of nurture and admonition, or discipline.

The baptized infant has, in its position in the Church, secured to it not merely human cultivation through parents, teachers, and pastors; but all these are at the same time divine activities under Christ and the Holy Spirit, by their divine appointment, and with promise of their coöperation and blessing, that by means of these it may have all those surroundings in the bosom of the Church, by

whose silent and steady inworkings, it may grow in a healthy Christian life. These are to its life and growth in grace what the soil, the rain, the dew, the warmth and light of the sun, are to the plant.

The conclusions to which we have come will enable us to answer the question: What is a Catechumen? It is one baptized, and as such occupying a position different from the unbaptized; this is a position in the Church, of which he is now a member, by virtue of which he is entitled to the name Christian; with these advantages he is in grace, having the remission of sin, the indwelling of the Holy Ghost; and thus the basis and beginning of regeneration, with the full warrant, and all the means necessary for growth in grace to a full self-conscious Christian life. Such in the highest sense, and in the only true sense, is a Catechumen.

Lancaster, Pa.

H. H.

ART. VII.—MANSEL'S LIMITS OF RELIGIOUS THOUGHT.

An opposite theory to the doctrine of the Absolute and Infinite, which we have endeavored to unfold in the Article on *Religion and Christianity*, has recently been developed by Professor Mansel, in his *Bampton Lectures*,* with great acumen, and an unusual degree of clearness of thought and expression. An argument based on so much sound scholarship and conducted with so much skill merits special consideration.

Mansel is the disciple of Sir William Hamilton, and differs from him in the philosophy of the Absolute mainly as regards the fulness and design with which he has wrought out a principle of criticism common to both. Both, however, are only exponents in the English language of what was laid down critically as the limits of the logical understanding nearly a hundred years ago by Kant,† the Aristotle of the eighteenth century. According to Kant, all knowledge, properly speaking, pertains to the finite world and the principles or categories of the understanding. These categories are relative: they correspond to the particular things of which through sensation the understanding becomes conscious. They are also finite, being limited to a single thing, or single things, in distinction one from the other. Active under the directive and formative power of these categories or principles, the understanding perceives

* The Limits of Religious Thought examined in Eight Lectures delivered before the University of Oxford, in the year MDCCCLVIII on the Bampton Foundation. By Henry Longueville Mansel, B. D., Reader in Moral and Metaphysical Philosophy at Magdalen College; Tutor and late Fellow of St. John's College. First American from the third London Edition. Boston: Gould & Lincoln.

† Emanuel Kant, born April 22, 1724, and died 1804, styled by Tenemann a second Socrates, creator of a new philosophy. The author of twenty-five or thirty philosophical works, of which the principal are: *Kritik der reinen Vernunft*, first published in 1781; *Kritik der praktischen Vernunft*, Riga, 1788; *Grundlegung zur Metaphysik der Sitten*, Riga, 1786; *Die Religion innerhalb der Grenzen der blossen Vernunft*, Königsburg, 1792. Professor of Logic and Metaphysics in the University of Königsburg from 1770 to 1797. Received calls to Jena, Erlangen and Halle, but declined them all. Never travelled beyond the limits of his own Province. Did not even get to Danteic. Was not married. An acute, profound and original thinker; and an upright, moral man.

and conceives a thing ; judges, or affirms and denies of it certain attributes and relations ; and concludes, or passes through a logical process by which the truth of one proposition is derived from the truth of others. All knowing must lie within the circumference of this circle, the limits of which are fixed by the laws of the human understanding. Beyond this limit there can not be an object of thought and knowledge. To think and reason as if there could be is but to deal with an illusion.

The reason, on the contrary, as distinguished from the understanding, has intuitive ideas of self or of the soul ; of the unity of the world ; and of the Absolute and Infinite, or of God. But these ideas have no objective significance. We do not know whether that of which the reason possesses ideas is, or is not. The reason has the ideas ; this we know ; but whether that exists of which the reason has ideas, we do not know. In the first act of knowing, or attempting to-know, the understanding is active ; we necessarily begin to conceive and judge ; and when we conceive and judge of the postulates of the reason we apply the finite principles of the understanding to that which lies beyond the sphere of the finite, and the mind is involved in a logical contradiction. We think of the Infinite as if it were the finite ; and of the Absolute as if it were the relative. Hence the intuitive idea of God can not be the basis of any knowledge of God ; not of His attributes, nor of His existence. On the same ground, however, we can neither deny His existence. The being of God is a matter of indifference to logical philosophy. Mind is reduced to pure *nescience*, or to a state of not knowing as regards whatever does not fall within the circle of the Finite. Hence the possibility of a supernatural revelation in the Person of Christ is denied ; and dogmatic as well as speculative theology are ruled out of the catalogue of the sciences.

Binding him hand and foot, the system of Kant puts a strait-jacket upon man and then casts him out into outer darkness. In this condition the ideas of the reason, he teaches, become the canon of experience, and regulative of

moral conduct. They enable us to classify our impressions and behave decently as we tumble about hopelessly in the blackness of the dark spiritual night.

Led on by the genius of Hamilton, the *Limits of Religious Thought* are a free, independent and fresh reproduction in beautiful English of the Kantian philosophy. But with this difference. Whilst Kant develops his fundamental hypothesis logically to its last conclusions and boldly blots out the being of God from the firmament of rational vision, Mansel believes in God, and Christ, and the Word of God, in defiance of his metaphysical hypothesis and his destructive logical reasoning. By the force of will he clings to his Faith; though the knowledge of God which he would hold on the ground of supernatural Revelation contradicts all the laws of knowledge. The mind of no philosopher, however, much less the mind of any age, can rest content in a living contradiction. The Critical Philosophy, because it involves truth, though not based upon a true principle, must in its progress on English and American soil eliminate faith in supernatural Revelation to which it is antagonistic, or Christian faith must expose and cast out the negations and contradictions of the Critical Philosophy. The former we apprehend will be the first effect produced among a large class of thinking men; though in the nature of the case a reaction will soon follow; and the work of Mansel, written with the design to defend Christian Truth against the violent attacks of legions of Pantheists, Rationalists and Infidels with their own weapons, will prove to be a blind surrender of the Citadel itself into the hands of its foes.

The principal paralogism of Kant, Sir William Hamilton and particularly of Mansel, is a contradiction between the fundamental principle and the logic, or logical argumentation, of the Critical Philosophy. Taking the true position that the proper object of the human understanding is the Finite, and the Finite only, because the categories or subjective generic forms of logical thinking are limited, the critical philosophers nevertheless presume to think and

judge of the Absolute and Infinite. The Absolute is that which is without all conditions and relations. The Infinite is that which is beyond all limits. They think of the Absolute and Infinite; they make both the object of conception and judgment, and thus of the understanding; yet according to the all-pervading idea of the Critical Philosophy, neither one is that of which the human mind can think. They even proceed to describe the Absolute and define the Infinite, at least negatively. They say what the Absolute is not; what the Infinite is not; what either can not be, and can not become; denying all relations and conditions of the Absolute, and all limits of the Infinite; and assuming even that the Absolute is antagonistic to and necessarily excludes the Relative, and that the Infinite is antagonistic to and necessarily excludes the Finite. Yet this logical criticism proceeds on the broad principle that the Relative and Finite only, nothing above and beyond, are the legitimate objects of conception and judgment; as if these negative assertions could be made concerning the Absolute, and yet the Absolute be not an object of thought; or made concerning the Infinite, and yet the Infinite be not an object of thought. The contradiction is direct. To name the Absolute is to make it an object. To assert that the Absolute is without relations, is both to think and judge of it. To name the Infinite is to make it an object of thought. To assert that the Infinite is without all limitation, is both to think and judge of the Infinite. Thus to make the Absolute or Infinite, either or both, an object of thought on the principle that neither is an object of thought; thus to think and judge of either on the principle that the human reason can neither think nor judge of either; is fatal at once to all the confident criticisms of the Critical Philosophy. In the attempt to turn all thinking of the Absolute, whether positive or negative, into absurdity and destroy it, the Critical Philosophy turns itself into self-contradiction and absurdity; for from the beginning to the end of all its criticisms it does the very thing which on its fundamental hypothesis can not be done. It runs the knife into its own heart.

This contradiction underlies the criticisms of Kant; especially his criticisms on religion, on the possibility of supernatural Revelation and all the peculiar institutions and duties of the Christian Church, as may be seen by reference, among others, to his work entitled: *Die Religion innerhalb der Græenzen der blossen Vernunft*. The categories and laws of the logical understanding as finite and relative he develops and classifies with more acuteness and fulness than has been done by any modern philosopher. Here is his strength. Here the chief value of his metaphysical studies. But when he argues that, because the forms of human judgment and thinking are finite, the Finite only can be the object of thought; he makes an assumption for which on the basis of his own philosophy there is no warrant. He assumes that the Infinite excludes the Finite, and the Finite the Infinite; that the human reason can not think of the Infinite in the form of the Finite; and that therefore every seeming effort to think of the Infinite is illusory and self-contradictory. But Kant overlooks the fact that the criticism violates its own principle. To say that the mind can think of the Finite only, is already to think of something else which is not finite. To affirm that the Infinite and Finite are reciprocally exclusive, is not only to make both the object of thought, but also to judge of both. To assume that the Infinite can not be thought of in the form of the Finite, implies an idea of the nature or being of the Infinite, and of its relation to the Finite. Thus in ruling out the Infinite critically from the sphere of conception, judgment and knowledge, Kant thinks and judges of what he pronounces it an impossibility to think and to judge; himself exemplifying the fallacy of all the negative criticisms of the Infinite and Absolute by the Critical Philosophy.

The same fundamental contradiction underlies the *Limits of Religious Thought* by Mansel. The impossibility of thinking of the Absolute is thus summed up: "The Absolute can not be conceived as conscious, neither can it be conceived as unconscious: it cannot be conceived as com-

plex, neither can it be conceived as simple : it can not be conceived by difference, neither can it be conceived by the absence of difference ; it can not be identified with the universe, neither can it be distinguished from it." p. 79. Thus we are landed in an inextricable dilemma. Again he says : "The conception of the Absolute and Infinite, from whatever side we view it, appears encompassed with contradictions. There is a contradiction in supposing such an object to exist, whether alone or in conjunction with others ; and there is a contradiction in supposing it not to exist. There is a contradiction in conceiving it as one ; and there is a contradiction in conceiving it as many. There is a contradiction in conceiving it as personal ; and there is a contradiction in conceiving it as impersonal. It can not without contradiction be represented as active ; nor, without equal contradiction, be represented as inactive. It cannot be conceived as the sum of all existence ; nor can it be conceived as a part only of that sum." p. 85. The whole of this web of contradictions, Mansel accounts for by saying that it "is woven from one original warp and woof ;—namely, the impossibility of conceiving the coexistence of the Infinite and the Finite, and the cognate impossibility of conceiving a first commencement of phenomena, or the Absolute giving birth to the Relative. The laws of thought appear to admit of no possible escape from the meshes in which it is entangled, save by destroying one or the other of the cords of which they are composed." p. 81. The impossibility of conceiving the coexistence of the Infinite and the Finite, Mansel deduces from an idea of both. So does he deduce the impossibility of conceiving of the coexistence of the Absolute and Relative from his idea of them. "By the *Absolute*," he says, "is meant that which exists in and by itself, having no necessary relation to any other Being. By the *Infinite*, is meant that which is free from all possible limitation ; that than which a greater is inconceivable ; and which, consequently can receive no additional attribute or mode of existence, which it had not from all eternity." p. 75. Here

we have a definition of the Absolute, and a definition of the Infinite. The definition is negative ; but as there can be no negation without position ; as the mind can not deny certain attributes or relations of an object without an idea of what the object is as the ground of denial ; this negative definition implies a positive idea of the Absolute and Infinite in the mind of the author. The positive idea appears even in the form of the definition. The Absolute is *that which exists in and by itself*. This is a positive affirmation concerning the Absolute ; and necessarily implies a positive conception or idea of the object. Then follows the negative form of the definition : the Absolute is that which *has no necessary relation to any other Being*. The definition is both positive and negative ; and implies not only an idea but a distinct and accurate idea of the Absolute and Infinite. This definition comes to view as the major proposition at every turn throughout the Bampton Lectures. It is the hinge on which the reasoning hangs. It is the hammer with which Mansel drives and clinches every nail in the entire frame-work of argumentation. Take these definitions away and the logic tumbles to the ground.

Yet Professor Mansel maintains that the absolute and infinite One is not an object of thought ; that any conception of the Absolute or Infinite involves necessarily a logical contradiction. It is accordingly the special design of his Lectures to show that the human mind can not think of any object but the Finite and Relative. In other words, Mansel thinks of the Absolute and Infinite in order to prove that the human mind can not think of the Absolute and Infinite ; he has a conception or idea in his own mind of the Absolute and Infinite, from which he deduces the conclusion that no human being can legitimately have such an idea or conception ; he lays down a definition of the Absolute and Infinite, expressed in both positive and negative form, and falls back on this definition as upon an immovable foundation at every turn of the argument, in order to demonstrate by means of it that every definition of the Absolute and Infinite, must necessarily be finite and rela-

tive, and therefore an absurdity; he concentrates the powers of his mind upon the Absolute and Infinite, thus making it an object of intense thought, in order to set forth the impossibility of making the Absolute and Infinite an object of thought. Here is a fundamental and thoroughgoing contradiction vitiating the very marrow and pervading the whole structure of the discussion—a contradiction that lies back of and annihilates all the contradictions and negations which Mansel presumes to expose. He does the very thing which it is the design of the whole work to prove can not be done.

We do not forget that Mansel puts the reader on his guard against misunderstanding the course of reasoning. He would not assert that the contradictions he develops are in the Absolute and Infinite, objectively considered, but in the *conception* only of the human mind. "What we have hitherto been examining, be it remembered," he remarks, "is not the nature of the Absolute in itself, but only our own conception of that nature. The distortions of the image reflected may arise from the inequalities of the mirror reflecting it." p. 85. But the caution does not relieve the argument. A conception is a conception of an object. If not, it is a pure abstraction, a subtlety, an illusion of the imagination that is entitled to no attention. This is a principle, however, that Mansel himself states very clearly on p. 96: "A second characteristic of Consciousness is, that it is only possible in the form of a *relation*. There must be a *Subject*, or person conscious, and an *Object*, or thing of which he is conscious. There can be no consciousness without the union of these two factors; and, in that union, each exists only as it is related to the other." Then he proceeds to argue that there can be no conception of an absolute object; because "an object of thought exists as such, in and through its relation to a thinker; while the Absolute, as such, is independent of all relation." p. 97. Thus he reaches the same conclusion. We must believe that the Absolute exists, but the mind can have no conception of it. The Absolute can not be a

positive object of thought. Why not? Because a conception involves relation; but the Absolute is independent of all relation. Here appears the self-contradictory reasoning. The principle that the *Absolute is independent of all relation* involves both a conception and a judgment of the Absolute; from this *conception* Mansel presumes to demonstrate that there can be no conception at all of the Absolute; from this judgment that there can be no judgment of the Absolute. Can a logical contradiction be more manifest? That either a *conception* or a *judgment* of the Absolute is an utter impossibility, the learned author would prove by reasoning from a conception and a judgment. In the attempt to annihilate all forms of infidel philosophy, Mansel annihilates himself.

Nor can Mansel escape from self-annihilation on the ground that the negative definition is not adopted as his own, but given as the definition of a philosophy which he rejects and condemns. For he lays it down formally as a view that *must* always be taken into account. He says: "There are three terms familiar as household words, in every vocabulary of Philosophy, which must be taken into account in every system of Metaphysical Theology. To conceive the Deity as He is, we must conceive Him as First Cause, as Absolute, and as Infinite. By the *First Cause*, is meant that which produces all things, and is itself produced of none. By the *Absolute*, is meant that which exists in and by itself, having no necessary relation to any other Being. By the *Infinite*, is meant that which is free from all possible limitation." p. 75. From this passage it is evident, that Mansel adopts these fundamental ideas of Metaphysical Theology, as certain and necessary; that is, he acknowledges them as the *conceptions* which the reason necessarily forms in thinking of God; and as such he employs them through the whole course of Lectures. From beginning to end they constitute the principle of argumentation. These negative definitions are the ultimate propositions upon which Mansel falls back at every step; and from them deduces the contradictions which, he holds, are in-

volved in a conception of the Absolute and Infinite. They are the only form in which man can conceive or think of God. As a consequence he takes the broad ground that *man can not know God*. A conception or judgment which is self-contradictory and therefore self-destructive, is the only one the human mind can have of God. Therefore the human mind can have no conception of God at all; God cannot be the positive object of thought or knowledge; He can not reveal Himself to man; supernatural Revelation, or a revelation of the Divine Nature, is an impossibility. These are the sweeping conclusions of the book—incontrovertible conclusions, as he maintains, at which he arrives by reasoning logically from the *conceptions* and *definitions* of the Absolute and Infinite which he states, over and over again, in almost every possible form of expression. Accordingly the thoroughgoing self-contradiction which we charge upon the Critical Philosophy remains, and even becomes more glaring. Mansel argues against the possibility of a conception of God on the basis of the conceptions and definitions which, to use his own words, must be taken into account in every system of Metaphysical Theology.

That we do not misrepresent the views of this Christian Author concerning the possibility of a revelation of the Divine Nature, we could easily establish by various quotations from different parts of these Bampton Lectures; but the necessity is entirely superseded by a formal statement in his Preface to the third Edition.* "It has been objected by reviewers of very opposite schools, that to deny to man a knowledge of the Infinite is to make Revelation itself impossible, and to leave no room for evidences on which reason can legitimately be employed. The objection would be pertinent, if I had ever maintained that Revelation is or can be a direct manifestation of the Infinite Nature of God. But I have constantly asserted the very reverse. In Revelation, as in Natural Religion, God is represented under

*Dated, Oxford, February 18th, 1859.

finite conceptions, adapted to finite minds; and the evidences on which the authority of Revelation rests are finite and comprehensible, also. It is true that in Revelation, no less than in the exercise of our natural faculties, there is indirectly indicated the existence of a higher and more absolute truth, which, as it can not be grasped by any effort of human thought, cannot be made the vehicle of any valid philosophical criticism." (Preface p. 22.) It is correct to say that Revelation cannot be a direct manifestation of the Infinite Nature of God, if the meaning be that God can reveal Himself to man, a finite being, only in a finite or human form. But it is evident from the context that such is not the sense in which Mansel uses the language. Whilst he holds that God is represented in finite conceptions, these finite conceptions do not make God known to man as He really is, or can not make known His Infinite Nature. A finite conception only we possess, which can not represent the Infinite or communicate an idea of it. The existence of a higher truth than the finite conception is only *indirectly indicated*. So far then as God Himself or the Nature of God is concerned, Revelation is impotent.* Of what God, the infinite One, really is, men are as truly in ignorance now as they were before the Incarnation of the Son of God. We have only human conceptions of God, which, on the one hand, contradict His Nature under whatever aspect it may be considered, and on the other

* The language which denotes the Infinite, according to Mansel "is wholly without meaning. It implies an attempt to think, and a failure in accomplishing the attempt." Preface p. 28. "Men speculate and reason," he says in another place, "concerning the Infinite, without being aware that their language represents, not thought, but its negation. They attempt to separate the condition of finiteness from their conception of a given object; and it is not till criticism has detected the self-contradiction involved in the attempt, that we learn at last that all human efforts to conceive the Infinite are derived from the consciousness, not of what it is, but only of what it is not," p. 25. As if the consciousness of what the Infinite is not, did not imply a conception of the Infinite as a positive object of thought as really as a consciousness of what it is. If the idea of the Infinite be not thought, namely, that in the mind corresponding to an entity out of the mind, but only a negation, only a figment of the imagination; with what logical propriety can Mansel say that the supposed consciousness of the Infinite is but the consciousness of what the Infinite is not? A consciousness only of what the Infinite is not, is the essence of a *contradictio in affectu*.

can only indicate indirectly the existence of a Truth which is higher and more absolute than themselves. The necessary inference is that Revelation is no revelation. The professed Revelation of God is but a system of human conceptions and human notions, which in the nature of the case can give us no knowledge of God, but can only serve the purpose of regulating our belief and moral conduct. The conclusion would mow down, not reason and knowledge only, but faith also were it not for the palpable contradiction which, like a two-edged blade, cuts through the very heart of all the reasoning; this learned effort to show that no man can think consistently of the Infinite, even by means of supernatural Revelation in Jesus Christ, being itself the most elaborate specimen of intense thinking and reasoning on the Infinite in the light of a definite idea of it, that Great Britain has given to the world during the present century.

The reasoning of Mansel is open to another criticism. It is a ruling idea of the Lectures that the limits of thought are to be determined by the nature and laws of thought. Thought can not transcend itself. The human understanding is finite; the categories and laws of the understanding are finite; hence the understanding is necessarily limited in its activity to the finite world, and Infinite Being is excluded from the entire range of the human reason. It is *terra incognita*; and any attempt to think of the Absolute and Infinite involves thought in hopeless self-contradiction.

This is the general position of Mansel. In addition to the fundamental contradiction which the simple statement of his position involves, as we have already shown, there is throughout the entire metaphysical disquisition a violation of a primary law of thought. In his close negative reasoning on the Absolute and Infinite, Mansel violates the very laws of thought which, according to the conclusion of his reasoning, interdict all reflection on the Absolute and Infinite; as will appear from a brief analysis of his logic, which is prevailingly according to the *deductio in absurdum* method.

Starting with the psychological truth that the categories and laws of human thinking are finite and relative, he takes as the basis of the whole process of reasoning the broad principle that the Absolute and the Infinite One, or God, is no positive object of thought. The only possible state of the human reason in relation to God is that of ignorance or negation. There can be no conception of what the Absolute is. Therefore the mind can not affirm any state, activity, attribute, or relation of the Absolute; for affirmation presupposes knowledge or conception. Nor can the mind have any positive intuition of what the Absolute is; for a positive intuition arises in consciousness in the form of definite conception, involving the relation of subject and object. Nor can Revelation impart to man any knowledge of the Divine Nature; because such knowledge could come to the mind only in a relative and finite form, which would involve the same contradiction. Thus the human reason is shut up to a state of necessary total ignorance, or to a state of not knowing, in regard to the Absolute and Infinite, from which it can not be delivered by any act of God or any effort of man. Mansel proceeds to show—and this is the principal aspect under which the whole subject is discussed—that every effort of the reason to know God has ended in some form of Pantheism or Atheism, or in a conclusion directly contradicting the principle with which the philosophy of the Absolute begins; and more than this, that every effort of the reason to know God, no matter when or by whom it may be made, must of necessity terminate in such self-contradiction and self-destruction.

But how does Mansel entangle all thought and philosophy in hopeless self-destruction? How does he show that every attempt to know and reflect upon God must terminate in the absurd? He does it by assuming a false principle of logical reasoning—a principle which is nowhere discussed nor even named, but which is every where applied as if it were an axiomatic truth. It consists in denying attributes, state or relations of that of which the mind

can have no direct conception. This is a violation of a fundamental law of thought, technically called by logicians the Law of Contradiction. I can affirm an attribute or relation of that only which is an object of thought. I must know the object; distinguish it from other objects; distinguish it from self and from consciousness; perceive a distinction in the relations which it bears to other objects; in order to affirm. For affirmation consists in saying what an object of thought is, or what as a part of itself belongs to an object of thought. This presupposes positive knowledge. My knowledge may be complete or only partial. If complete I can affirm the whole of what the object is; I can set all the attributes of the manifold unity in the predicate of a proposition. If partial, I can affirm as far as I know. But I need not know in whole in order to affirm in part. If I really know in part I can affirm in part. A partial affirmation is justified by partial knowledge. But I can not affirm in whole if I know only in part. I can affirm no more than I know. If I know nothing I can affirm nothing. If an object is not an object of my thought I can not even name it. If I have an object of thought but can not distinguish an attribute as belonging to it, I can not affirm an attribute of it. If I see no relation which the object bears to other objects, I can not affirm a relation of it. Entire ignorance, or the mental state of not knowing, precludes the possibility of logical affirmation.

The same principle is valid as regards negation. To deny is to say what an object of thought is not. It is to assert that a given attribute, or state, or relation does not belong to the object. This presupposes positive and full knowledge. I can deny only on two conditions. The first condition is that that of which I deny any thing must be an object of thought. If an object be not an object of thought, if I have no conception or idea of it, I can neither affirm nor deny. For in the act of denying I take the object as an object of thought. To affirm and deny, to limit and restrict, are but the definite forms in which I think of an

object. The second condition is that that of which I deny any thing I must know. If I do not know the object I can not deny any thing of it. If I do not know its state, I cannot say that a given state is not the state of the object; for I can not distinguish. I can not distinguish the known from the unknown. If I do not know the attributes of an object, I can not say that a given attribute is not one of them; for as before I cannot distinguish. If I do not know *all* the attributes of an object; if I know only in part, but not in whole; then I cannot deny either; I can say that a given attribute does not belong to the object; for the given attribute may be among those attributes of the object of which I am ignorant. If I do not know all the relations of an object, I cannot say that a given relation does not belong to it; and for the same reason; the given relation may be among the relations of which I am ignorant. Further: if I do not know an object I can not assert that it has no relations at all. I can say that it has no relations only if I *know* that it has no relations. I can not say that it has no limits only when I *know* that it has no limits. For if I do not know any thing, I can not assert any thing, either affirmatively or negatively. If an object be not known to me and besides not an object of my thought, I can say of it nothing at all. This is according to the demands of the law of negation—a necessity in the reason determining the conditions and order of its conscious activity. The law of negation requires me to deny of an object what I know it is not, or know does not belong to it; and forbids denial when I do not know; forbids me to assert what an object is not when I do not know the object, or do not know what I say.

The law of negation and the law of affirmation are but different formal expressions of one principle. That principle is a conception or idea of an object as the indispensable condition, or *sine qua non*, of all assertion concerning it. Knowledge is the necessary basis of rational activity, or of a logical process of the understanding, according to either form of assertion. There is this difference, however. A par-

tial knowledge of an object justifies a partial affirmation; but a partial knowledge does not justify a partial negation. The law of affirmation permits me to affirm in part if I know in part, or to affirm as much as I know; but the law of negation does not permit me to deny, whether in whole or in part, unless I know in whole. Thoroughgoing knowledge is the only basis of partial negation.

Now, if the Absolute is no positive object of thought; if I have not and can not have a conception of it; I can neither affirm nor deny anything concerning it; I can not say what it is, nor what it is not; I can not assert that the Absolute has relations, nor that it has no relations. I can deny logically all conditions and all relations of the Absolute only if I *know* that the Absolute has no conditions and no relations. But I can not know that the Absolute has neither conditions nor relations unless I know the Absolute itself; for the one necessarily presupposes the other. Hence to deny all relations of the Absolute on the ground that the Absolute is no positive object of thought and therefore the unknown, is a direct violation of the law of negation, a primary law of thinking. It is a process of thinking in violation of the first law of thinking, as undoubted a violation as it would be to deny weight of the atmosphere on the principle that the human mind can form no intelligent judgment concerning the properties and relations of the atmosphere, or to deny a salubrious climate of an island in the Pacific that no man has ever discovered or can ever discover.

The same law is violated in negative reasoning on the Infinite. If the Infinite is not and can not be a positive object of thought; if it be to me the unknown; I can make no assertion concerning it; I can not say that it has limits, nor can I say that it has no limits. I can deny all limitation of the Infinite only when I *know* that it is without all limitation; but I can not know that it has no limitations unless I know the Infinite itself; for the one presupposes the other. A knowledge of the Infinite as having no limits is, after all, nothing less than a knowledge of the Infinite.

Hence to deny all limitation of the Infinite on the principle that the Infinite is no positive object of thought, and therefore the unknown and inconceivable, is a direct contradiction. It is an effort to think in violation of the laws of thought. It is a knowing of that which is not and can not be known, than which no proposition could logically be more absurd.

Here we meet Mansel in his own way. We meet Sir William Hamilton, Emanuel Kant and the whole school of Critical Philosophy on their own ground. The Critical Philosophy itself violates the laws of thought which it defines, and for the necessity of conformity to which it contends. Laying it down as an axiom, which all must admit, that the human reason can think only according to its own laws and forms of thought, they determine critically that man can think and acquire philosophical knowledge of relative and finite objects only, because the laws and forms of thought are relative and finite. Then they immediately transcend the Relative and Finite, and determine that philosophical and theological knowledge of the Absolute and Infinite is necessarily self-contradictory and absurd, because the Absolute has no relations and the Infinite has no limits. But the criticism is a fallacy. If the forms of thought are relative and therefore the Relative only can be an object of thought, it is a contradiction to name the Absolute. The word *Absolute* can be but a hollow, unmeaning sound. It can not stand in the mind for any corresponding object out of the mind. But the Critical Philosophy deals with the Absolute as the name of a veritable object transcending the sphere of the Relative, and directs its criticisms against it as an object of thought of which it is impossible to have a thought. This is the first direct contradiction—the *πρῶτον ψῆδος* of the whole School of Critical Philosophy. The criticisms of the Absolute violate the laws of thought which, as the entire School affirms, limit thought to the Relative only. If the laws of thought limit thought to the Relative and Finite, then neither Kant, Mansel, nor any other person can assert any thing either affir-

Latively or negatively concerning that which is neither relative nor finite.

At this point, however, Mansel, in keeping with the method of the Critical Philosophy, sets up an arbitrary distinction which involves his criticisms in a still more glaring contradiction. Because the forms of thought are relative and therefore the only objects of thought are relative objects, Mansel maintains that the mind can not think of the Absolute and Infinite, meaning that the mind can not *affirm* any thing concerning them. We can not affirm God to be the *First Cause*, or a *Person* or the *Creator*; because such affirmations involve knowledge of that which is not an object of thought and can not be known. But he claims and exercises the right to think of God negatively. Whilst he forbids all men to affirm, he denies. No man may make an assertion affirmatively, but he may make an assertion negatively. He asserts that the Absolute has no relations and no conditions. This negative assertion is made of an object which, as he affirms, is no object of thought; of which the mind can have no conception; of which he knows nothing and can know nothing. But the Law of Negation requires him to know in order to deny; and forbids him to deny peremptorily if he does not know. It requires him to know the Absolute in order to deny all relations and conditions of the Absolute; and forbids him to deny relations of the Absolute if he does not know the Absolute. Mansel, however, insists that he knows nothing of the Absolute, yet asserts with the utmost confidence that the Absolute is independent of all relation; and thus himself directly violates the laws of thought in his attempt to expound and vindicate them.

In like manner he forbids all men to think of the Infinite, meaning that they may not *affirm* concerning it, because it can not be an object of thought to a finite mind. But he denies of the Infinite all limitation, which is nothing less than to think of it. No man may think of the Infinite, but Mansel may think. He asserts of the Infinite, an object of which he can have no conception, of which he can

not know any thing, that it is without limitation. Here again Mansel violates the Law of Negation; which requires him to deny limitation of the Infinite if he *knows* that it has no limitation; but forbids him to deny limitation if he does not know any thing of it. But Mansel persists in thinking of the Infinite on the principle that no man can think of it; persists in the assertion that the Infinite is without limits on the principle that no man can assert anything concerning it; persists thus in violating a primary law of thought in order to demonstrate how the philosophy of the Infinite, and all philosophical Theology, violates the laws of thought.

This logical fallacy pervades the book. That the Absolute is independent of all relation, and that the Infinite is without limits, are the fundamental negative propositions on which all the processes of reasoning depend. From these Mansel proves the contradictions involved in the idea of the Absolute, and the contradictions involved in the idea of the Infinite. From these he would prove that the Absolute can not be conceived as a necessary and unconscious Cause, nor as a voluntary and conscious cause, nor as possessing consciousness at all, nor as containing within itself any kind of relation, nor as one and simple, out of all relation. From these he would prove that we can not think of God, nor of God as a personal Being, nor of Him as Creator, nor of Him as First Cause. And by these propositions he shows how all possible ideas of the Absolute and Infinite, or of God, run into absurdity and self-annihilation. This violation of a fundamental law of thought underlies and pervades every form of argument, positive or negative, which characterizes the Bampton Lectures. It is the great power of its destructive logic.

These fundamental propositions, or negative assertions, concerning the Absolute and Infinite, involve the two principal contradictions we have endeavored to unfold as underlying all the criticisms of *Mansel's Limits of Religious Thought*. The first main position is that the Absolute and Infinite are not legitimate objects of human thought.

This is directly contradicted by these negative definitions, for the Absolute and Infinite become an object of thought in the act of defining them negatively, and in the processes of reasoning concerning them running through the whole disquisition. The second main position is expressed in these propositions themselves, namely, that the Absolute is independent of all relations and conditions, and the Infinite of all limits. Assuming the first position to be true, that the mind can form no idea of the absolute and infinite One, this second position becomes a direct violation of the Law of Negation. On these two contradictions hang all the logic and its sweeping results.

These two self-contradictory positions, moreover, are themselves reciprocally exclusive. If it be true that the Absolute and Infinite are no positive object of thought, then the negative definitions of them, are, as we have shown, a manifest violation of the Law of Negation, and all the reasoning on the basis of these definitions must fall to the ground. On the other hand, if these negative definitions are allowed to stand as valid, then in the very act of pronouncing them valid the Absolute and Infinite are constituted a positive object of thought, and all the reasoning which proceeds on the basis of the first position, that the Absolute and Infinite are no object of thought, must of necessity be purely fallacious. So take either fundamental position, accept either term of the reasoning, and Mansel's criticisms of metaphysics and Theology become self-destructive.

The case becomes worse still when we consider that the validity of Mansel's criticisms is not sustained by the truth of either one of his fundamental positions taken by itself; but the validity of all his criticisms depends on the truth of both. Either position being false, the criticisms are self-destructive; but both must be true, if they shall be valid; for all the reasoning presupposes the truth, not of either one, but of both taken together. There is therefore, a double logical impossibility of truth in the criticisms.—Both fundamental positions can not be true logically; for

they are mutually exclusive. The truth of the first determines the falsity of the second, and the truth of the second determines the falsity of the first. Now as the falsity of either position vitiates the criticisms of Mansel, and as one or the other *must* be false, it is manifest that the criticisms can not be valid. Here is the first logical necessity by which the criticisms become self-destructive. The criticisms, however, assume that both fundamental positions are true; and they can be valid only if both are true. But as the truth of both is a logical impossibility, it becomes manifest again from this view of the argument, that the criticisms can not be valid. Here is the second, and a deeper, logical necessity of self-contradiction in the criticisms themselves. Accordingly the critical argument of Mansel destroys itself by a two-fold logical necessity. The process of criticism is not only illogical, but from the very nature of the first principles on which the reasoning proceeds the conclusions can not be any thing else but illogical, and therefore a formal absurdity. With great skill Mansel leads the thinker *volens volens*, who would affirm any attribute or relation of the Absolute and Infinite, by a spiral path down into a horrible pit of dark negations and contradictions; but he does it unwittingly, though with a great array of learning, by a winding ratiocinative process that casts himself to the bottom of the pit where he flounders and the Critical Philosophy flounders in the miry clay.

There is another deep fallacy pervading the *Limits of Thought* which has been very forcibly exposed by Dr. Hickock.* It is the dualistic view concerning the relation of reason to faith. On the basis of Revelation Mansel maintains the necessity of faith in an absolute and infinite God, whom He regards as a glaring absurdity to reason and thought. God has revealed Himself in His Word, and attested His Revelation by wonderful miracles. Therefore we should believe implicitly, though the act of believing be in contradiction of all the forms and laws of thought.—

*Vid. Bibliotheca Sacra. Jan. 1860. pp. 64-65.

But we do not propose to enter upon the discussion of this branch of the general subject.

There is one fundamental truth in the Critical Philosophy, and but one. It is that the forms and laws of thought are relative and finite. From this truth Kant, Mansel and the whole critical School draw a fallacious inference, namely, that the finite world only can be the object of thought. A sound psychology, however, postulates just the reverse. The Absolute and the Infinite exist no less than the Relative and Finite; and they exist as an object of thought; but the mind thinks of the Absolute in the forms of the Relative, of the Infinite in the forms of the Finite, of the Divine in the forms of the human—a proposition the full meaning and corroboration of which is given in the Incarnation of the Son of God.

Mansel separates and holds asunder antagonistically the Absolute and Relative, the Infinite and Finite, Reason and Faith, God and man. In the effort to escape the abyss of Pantheism he falls upon the rock of Dualism. Turning from one error, he embraces another equally fatal to philosophy, to theology and to practical religion. The only true and abiding solution of the problem is the Person of Christ, who is the absolute and infinite Godhead in real union with relative and finite Manhood. A sound Christology is the only basis of a sound philosophy.

E. V. G.

CANTATE DOMINO: A CORRECTION.

In our review of this excellent work, published in the January number, we stated in a note, p. 148, that the translation of Paul Gerhard's Passion Hymn contained an unfortunate blunder transferred from the new Liturgy. Upon a more careful examination of the matter, however, we are pleased to find that there is no ground for the criticism, the Passion Hymn being correctly printed as it came from the pen of Dr. Alexander.

E. V. G.

ART. VIII.—RECENT PUBLICATIONS.

FIVE YEARS' MINISTRY IN THE GERMAN REFORMED CHURCH, IN RACE STREET, BELOW FOURTH, PHILADELPHIA. An Anniversary Sermon, Preached Jan. 8th, 1860. With an Ecclesiastical Appendix, by Rev. J. H. A. Bomberger, D. D. Philadelphia: Lindsay & Blakiston. 1860. 72 pp.

The German Reformed Church in Race Street is one of the oldest in connection with the Synod of the German Reformed Church in America, and one of the oldest of all the churches in the city of Philadelphia. For an interesting account of its origin, and the vicissitudes and trials of its early history, we refer the reader to Harbaugh's *Life and Travels of Schlatter*, one of the most valuable contributions to American Church history. Though organized before 1734, more than one hundred and twenty-six years ago, there are up to this time but four German Reformed churches in the city. This want of a more rapid growth corresponding to that of other denominations in the city, cannot be owing to a want of material, nor to the absence of the divine blessing upon the labors of German Reformed ministers in Philadelphia. For the material has always been abundant, the Germans having all along since the first quarter of the last century constituted one of the strongest and most influential branches of the population. And God, true to His covenant, has always been prospering the labors of His ministering servants, the Church edifice in Race Street having often in the course of its history been too small to afford suitable accommodations to the crowds of worshippers that thronged its sacred courts.

The causes are different; but we will refer only to one. The main cause undoubtedly has been the want of German Reformed ministers. One English colony went out from the Race Street church, if we do not err, as early as 1809. It was organized as a German Reformed church, and for eight or nine years made efforts to obtain a Pastor. But it could not secure the services of a German Reformed minister who was properly qualified to minister to them in the *English* language; and finally, despairing of being supplied, it passed into the communion of the Reformed Protestant Dutch Church. We know of at least two other colonies of the Race Street church that have passed into the communion of other denominations. Even the Race Street church itself has not

had, since the resignation of the venerable Doctor Helffenstein, a pastor who was by birth and education a minister of the German Reformed Church until since the catastrophe of 1852. In these circumstances the more rapid extension of the German Reformed Church in Philadelphia, was almost an impossibility. Had the Theological Seminary and Marshall College been established each twenty-five years earlier, we might have four times the present number of churches, English and German.

To stand alone as an *English* church, as the Race Street Church has had to do for so many years, is itself a trial; for, wanting that cordial sympathy and support which is afforded by a large communion of different organizations resting on the same basis and possessing the same customs, mode of worship and order, its comparative isolation could not but be prejudicial to the progress of the German Reformed Church. Add to this the blow it received in 1852, perhaps the most severe and stunning in its whole history, when the Pastor withdrew with about three-fourths of the entire membership to form a new organization in connection with the Dutch Church; and we shall not be surprised to learn that the Race Street Church, though a century and a quarter old, numbers no more than 248 regular communicant members. Rather should we unite with the present Pastor, the Rev. Dr. Bomberger, and his people, in devout gratitude to Almighty God for His deliverance of that venerable church from the imminent peril into which it had been drawn.

The little volume which has called forth this brief historical notice, contains an earnest discourse by Dr. Bomberger commemorative of the great goodness and grace of God to the Race Street Church during the five years of his ministry, from the appropriate text: "The Lord hath done great things for us; whereof we are glad." (Ps. 126: 3.) And great cause that church has for thanksgiving and praise. The schismatic movement of 1852 had completely prostrated it. "Let the cause of the secession have been what it may," says the author, "the material, and in some respects the moral effects of it upon the congregation, were nearly the same. The numerical strength of the body was reduced to a point which imperiled its existence. The small band of members still remaining here, stunned by the shock of so unexpectedly wide-spread a movement, and finding themselves almost alone and lost in a house of worship calculated to accommodate a thousand persons, were, moreover, well nigh paralyzed with despondency, and tempted to give up the entire interest in despair. Their Sunday-school remained with but three teachers, and about twenty scholars, and the whole flock were as sheep without a shepherd. That apprehensions should be felt in such circumstances, of a total dissolution of the Old Race Street Church, is

not surprising. We must rather wonder that any recuperative element remained in a congregation so completely prostrated." p. 12. Yet the church has survived the shock. From this prostrate condition it has risen up again; and first under the brief but energetic ministry of Rev. Samuel H. Reid, and afterwards through the abundant labors of the present Pastor, has grown into position, strength, respectability and influence. Measures have also been taken for the erection of a branch church in the North-western section of the city, for which purpose property and money have already been secured to the amount of *twenty-four thousand dollars*. On these and other tokens of Divine favor the discourse dwells with simplicity, tenderness and power. The calm, irenic spirit which pervades it, is particularly commendable. There was opportunity for just and severe reflections upon the principal actor in the schism of '52, but the author refrains, in the spirit of Christian charity, from all direct references to the cause of the calamity.

The Appendix is a happy thought. It furnishes a succinct statement concerning the origin, name, doctrinal standards, form of government, public worship, benevolent Institutions, statistics, et cetera, of the German Reformed Church. Just such information as the members of the Race Street Church ought to have, and as should be in the possession of the members of all our churches. It would be well to reprint and translate the Appendix, or something on the same plan, in cheap form for general distribution in both languages.

E. V. G.

A DICTIONARY OF THE ENGLISH LANGUAGE by Joseph E. Worcester, LL. D. Boston: Hickling, Swan, and Brewer. pp. 1854.

Worcester's Quarto Dictionary is a complete dictionary of the English Language; its great aim being to exhibit the language as it has become and as it is, including orthography, etymology, pronunciation and definition. Such a work—a dictionary constructed on this true general principle of lexicography—has to the present time been a desideratum. The large work of Dr. Webster, it can not be denied, notwithstanding its great and undoubted merits, proceeds rather upon the idea of exhibiting the English language, as in that eminent lexicographer's judgment, it ought to be, judging of it in the light of certain theoretic principles—an idea, however, that has affected his dictionary only, or mainly, as it regards orthography and pronunciation. Worcester, on the other hand, is governed by no authority but by what must be regarded as good usage. This sound ruling principle we consider to be the distinctive characteristic of his valuable work.

The work opens with an interesting and instructive introduction comprising sixty-eight pages; and treats of Principles of Pronunciation; Orthography; English Grammar; Origin, Formation, and Etymology of the English Language; Archaisms, Provincialisms, and Americanisms; History of English Lexicography; a Catalogue of English Dictionaries, Glossaries, Encyclopaedias, &c., &c. Then follows the Dictionary itself, containing about 104,000 words; to which is annexed an Appendix giving the Pronunciation of Greek and Latin Proper Names; Pronunciation of Scripture Proper Names; Pronunciation of Modern Geographical Names; Pronunciation of the Names of distinguished men of Modern Times; Abbreviations used in Writing and Printing; Signs used in Writing and Printing; and a Collection of Words, Phrases, and Quotations from the Greek, Latin, French, Italian and Spanish Languages. On all these topics the work is accurate, thorough, succinct and comprehensive.

Instead of attempting an independent analysis of its various characteristic merits, we submit the following brief extracts from opinions expressed by some of the most eminent scholars in America.

"An authority among scholars every where."—JAMES WALKER, LL. D.

"The standard Dictionary of our language."—C. C. FELTON, LL. D.

"Superior to any Dictionary of our language."—M. B. ANDERSON, LL. D.

"A proud monument of accurate scholarship."—MARK HOPKINS, D. D.

"It is but a short time since that I was led to commend another Dictionary as, on the whole, and with some exceptions, the best and most complete thing of the kind within my knowledge. The communication was honestly given at the time; but now it must be withdrawn in favor of yours."—DANIEL R. GOODWIN, D. D.

"Truly a Thesaurus of the English language."—L. T. CHAMPLIN, D. D.

"No scholar can afford to be without your Dictionary."—N. LORD, D. D.

"Much superior to any other general Dictionary."—GEORGE P. MARSH.

"There is no department within the province of a Dictionary that has been left imperfect."—ANDREW P. PEABODY, D. D.

"I always felt myself wholly safe in your hands, when I had your smaller Dictionary. But with this 'Leviathan' it would be superfluous to look further."—JOSEPH LOVERING, A. M.

"I regard it as one of the best, if not the very best, published in our language."—ARCHBISHOP HUGHES, of New York.

"The Dictionary is indeed a monumental work."—OLIVER WENDELL HOLMES, M. D.

"I have no doubt it is the best."—ASA GRAY, A. M.

"It is an honor, not only to Boston, but to the whole country."—E. N. HORSFORD, A. M.

"More than equal to my expectations."—S. G. BROWN, A. M.

"The best and the most unexceptionable Dictionary of the English language."—GEO. B. EMERSON, LL. D.

"In all respects, the best, the most complete, and learned."—HOMAGE WEBSTER, LL. D.

"It is a Thesaurus of the language."—S. H. TAYLOR, LL. D.

"The best Lexicon of the English Language."—EPHRAIM S. DIXWELL, A. M.

"It is an honor to our country and to the English language."—HENRY A. BOARDMAN, D. D.

"The one authority upon all matters of English lexicography."—FRANCIS BOWEN, A. M.

"The standard Dictionary of the English language."—JOEL PARKER, LL. D.

"Of all the American Dictionaries of our language, your Quarto Edition will be henceforth the first I shall resort to."—FRANCIS LIEBER, A. M.

"The new and authentic etymologies, the conciseness and completeness of the definitions, the nicety with which the different shades of meaning in synonyms are distinguished, and the conscientious accuracy of the work in all its departments, give it, in my judgment, the highest claims to public favor."—WILLIAM CULLEN BRYANT.

"I concur with the opinion of Mr. Bryant."—WASHINGTON LIVING.

"It is pure gold. The great public want of a *Standard Dictionary* of the English language, which so long existed, is now supplied, thank Heaven!"—GEO. P. MORRIS, A. M.

"I cannot conceive that it has left anything to be desired in respect to definitions, orthography, etymology, pronunciation, copiousness, and whatever enters into the idea of a perfect Dictionary."—W. B. SPRAGUE, D. D.

These are strong testimonials to the eminent worth of this great work. But they are not too strong. All in all, it is without doubt the most valuable contribution to English lexicography—a distinguished honor to Dr. Worcester and to American scholarship.

E. V. G.

LECTURES ON THE ENGLISH LANGUAGE, by George P. Marsh.
New York. Charles Scribner. London: Sampson Low,
Son & Co. 8vo. pp. 697.

In pursuance of a plan for enlarging the means of education afforded by Columbia College in the city of New York, courses of instruction, called Post-graduate Lectures, were organized in the summer of 1858; and Mr. Marsh was invited by the Trustees of that institution to give readings on the English Language. The lectures which compose this volume were prepared and delivered in the Autumn of 1858-9. We remember reading brief reports of these lectures in the New York daily papers at the time of their delivery, and we were much interested in them; the treatment of the subjects successively discussed was evidently so original, scholarly, thorough and orthodox. We hoped at the time, that Mr. Marsh would be led to publish his lectures *in extenso*; and we are happy in possessing them now, printed very nearly in their original form, and making a goodly octavo of 697 pages, from the well-known press of Mr. Scribner.

Having given the very themes treated in this book considerable attention and study for several years, we are prepared, by a rapid perusal of the volume, to say that we know of no other work in the English language which will compare with Mr. Marsh's book. It is full of happy criticism and analysis, and exhibits throughout a modest yet thorough treatment of the difficulties and anomalies of our most difficult and anomalous tongue. We feel as we read on that the whole subject has been most carefully studied, *con amore*, and that fields of investigation have been traversed and explored which lie far distant from the beaten track of common travellers. It would have been easy on such a subject to make a show of cheap learning by a multitude of citations from many authorities, but our author has preferred, after pointing out sufficient sources of instruction, to leave the reader the pleasant and profitable task of seeking authorities for himself. And yet, it must not be supposed that this work is not adapted to the many rather than to the few. From the character of the audience before which the Lectures were delivered as well as the purpose the

author has in view, this work is well calculated to incite and continue a deeper interest, among our educated people generally, in the wonderful language it is their privilege to call their mother tongue.

We earnestly hope that the author of this book, who, honored by his country, has brought honor to his native land, by the successful accomplishment of a difficult literary labor, may be rewarded by seeing his work influential in raising the standard of English scholarship wherever the English language is spoken.

We add the following resumé of the contents of the volume:

- Introductory Lecture. On Philological Study.
- Lecture II. Origin of Speech, and of the English Language.
- " III. Practical uses of Etymology.
- " IV. Foreign helps to the Study of English.
- " V. Study of Early English.
- " VI. and VII. Sources and Composition of English.
- " VIII. to XII. The Vocabulary of the Eng. Language.
- " XIII. and XIV. The Parts of Speech.
- " XVI. to XVIII. Grammatical Inflections.
- " XIX to XXI. English as Affected by the art of Printing.
- " XXII. Orthoepical changes in English.
- " XXIII. Rhyme.
- " XXIV. Accentuation.
- " XXV. Alliteration, &c.
- " XXVI. Synonyms.
- " XXVII. Principles of Translation.
- " XXVIII. The English Bible.
- " XXXIX. Corruptions of English.
- " XXX. The English Language in America.

E.

THE FIRST ADAM AND THE SECOND. THE ELOHIM REVEALED IN THE CREATION AND REDEMPTION OF MAN. By *Samuel J. Baird*, D. D., Pastor of the Presbyterian church, Woodbury, N. J. Philadelphia : Lindsay & Blakiston.

A stately and imposing volume, which deserves a place among the most scholarly works of American divinity. Dr. Baird was known before as the author of a Digest of the Minutes of the O. S. Presbyterian Church, which is said to be a very useful and valuable book for every Presbyterian minister. The present book is of a more catholic and original character. The title is somewhat singular. *Elohim* is rather the God of Creation only, the God of the Gentiles as well as the Jews, while *Jehovah* is the God of redemption, the God of the covenant with his peculiar people. The book might perhaps have been more popularly called : The Christian doctrine of sin and grace. It forms a parallel to the celebrated monograph of Dr. Julius Müller on Sin, but goes further and supplies also the positive counterpart. It is quite an elaborate work which grapples manfully with the difficult problems of the fall of the first and the redemption of the second Adam, with special reference to the Anglo American controversies on imputation since the days of Jonathan Edwards. Its theology is substantially Old School Presbyterian, although it differs from the Princeton view on imputation. It holds "that at the bar of God no fictitious construction nor legal intendment is tolerated; that nothing is there imputed in any other sense than accords with the essential reality; that Adam's sin is charged against us no otherwise than inasmuch as it is really ours,—we sinned in him and fell with him, in his first transgression." We are promised a more extended review of this important work by another pen for the next number.

P. S.

THE WORDS OF THE LORD JESUS by *Rudolf Stier*. Translated from the second revised and enlarged German edition. By the Rev. *William B. Pope*: New edition. Philadelphia: Smith, English & Co. 1860. 6 vols. in 3.

When we first came to this country, we ventured to express the hope that the better works of the Evangelical Theology of Germany would exert a considerable influence upon English and American theology. But we had no idea at the time to what extent this would be the case. Our boldest expectations are far surpassed by fact. England, Scotland and America have rivalled, within the last ten years in their zeal to transfer the treasures of German literature into the English language. The best Commentaries of Bengel, Tholuek, Olshausen, Ebrard, Hengstenberg, Stier, Gerlach and others are now accessible to the English student and have in many instances found a far more extensive circulation than in their native Germany. This is a most signal and marvellous victory which German theology has achieved over its assailants. It is now literally flesh of our flesh and bone of our bone. Any attempt to root it out in America would be suicide. Such is the change wrought in so short a time.

Among these Anglo-German works on Biblical literature the Commentary of Dr. Stier on the Discourses of our Lord and Saviour occupy a very prominent place. It was no small task to translate so elaborate and extensive a work as this. Mr. Clark, the enterprising publisher of Edinburgh deserves great credit for having published it, and Messrs. Smith, English & Co. are equally entitled to the gratitude of American scholars for giving it to them in a new and more convenient edition. Dr. Stier is an able, thorough, pious and sound expounder of those words of truth and eternal life which the Saviour spoke in the days of his flesh for all future generations. He sits reverently at his feet like Mary, with humble submission to their divine authority. Ministers of the Gospel will find this Commentary a very useful guide in the preparation of sermons. Volumes V. and VI. contain the discourses of Christ recorded by the disciple who leaned on his bosom and drank deepest from that fountain of unerring truth, and unfailing life.

An additional volume (vol. IX of the original edition), translated by the same hand and republished by the same house treats of the Words of the Risen Saviour, and embodies also Stier's Commentary on the Epistle of St. James, which appeared first in 1845.

P. S.

THE HISTORICAL EVIDENCES OF THE TRUTH OF THE SCRIPTURE RECORDS stated anew, with special reference to the doubts and discoveries of modern times. In eight lectures delivered in the Oxford University Pulpit, in the year 1859, on the Bampton Foundation. By GEORGE RAWLINSON, M. A. From the London edition with the notes translated by Rev. A. N. Arnold. Boston: Gould & Lincoln. 1860.

The Rev. John Bampton, Canon of Salisbury, has done good service to the cause of Christian literature and nobly immortalized himself, when he devoted his rich estate to the University of Oxford for the maintenance of an annual course of eight Divinity Lecture Sermons for the defence and exposition of the Christian faith and the divine authority of the holy Scriptures. Several courses of the Bampton Lectures, as they are called, are of sterling merit and more than passing interest. Not a few of them have created a sensation and aroused a good deal of discussion. This was the case with the Lectures of Mansel on the *Limits of Religious Thought*, delivered in 1858. The last course, delivered in 1859, is a worthy successor and contains certainly one of the most valuable contributions to the Evidences of Christianity in the English Language. The author, a brother to the celebrated antiquarian, and editor of the History of Herodotus, has here made the results of the most extensive antiquarian discoveries and researches of modern times, the hieroglyphics of Egypt, the cuneiform records, the excavations of Syria, etc., tributary to the defence of the historical truth and accuracy of the Sacred Scriptures. It is a thorough and scholarly work upon a most important subject which lies at

the very basis of our faith in Christianity. It is a storehouse of powerful arguments against the mythical school of Strauss and other infidels who would fain deprive our religion of its true historical character by which it is so essentially different from all the heathen religions. One half of the volume consists of valuable learned notes. The American edition gives the Greek and other foreign quotations in an English translation, which will make them more accessible to the general reader, while the scholar, of course, always prefers the original.

P. S.

COMMENTARY ON THE PENTATEUCH. Translated from the German of OTTO VON GERLACH. By Rev. *Henry Downing*, Incumbent of St. Mary's, Kingswinford. Philadelphia: Smith, English & Co. Edinburg: T. & T. Clark. 1860.

Otto von Gerlach (born 1801 at Berlin, died 1849), first preacher of St. Elizabeth, and afterwards at the Dom (Cathedral) in Berlin, belongs to a remarkable aristocratic family of Prussia, which exerted a powerful influence in reviving evangelical piety among the higher classes of the Prussian capital. His two brothers, still living, are laymen, the one, Ludwig, a jurist and member of the first Prussian chamber, the other a general and aid de camp to the King, both men of deep piety, high moral character and dazzling brilliancy of mind, especially in conversation. Two eminent Presbyterian divines of America who became intimately acquainted with him on a foreign tour, assured me that Ludwig von Gerlach was the most remarkable man they met with in all Europe. I doubt whether Coleridge had greater conversational powers. The clergyman was the least genial, but the most learned, active and laborious of the three brothers. He attended to a very extensive and neglected parish in the capital with the most conscientious care, and still reserved time for the preparation of a popular Commentary on the Old and New Testament, although he died before it

was finally completed. This Commentary makes no pretension to be critical and learned, but is intended for a wider class of readers. Yet it is based upon a familiar acquaintance with all the scientific helps, and reveals careful investigation, and independent judgment. In its general character and tone it comes nearer the popular English Commentaries of the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries and falls in better with American taste than the more learned Commentaries of Tholuck, Olshausen, Hengstenberg, Bleek, Lücke, Harless, Delitsch and others. An English translation of this work, of which so far the Pentateuch only has appeared, will probably meet with extensive patronage. We can cordially recommend it to ministers as well as educated laymen. In fact ministers and students who wish a German Commentary which leaves out the critical and learned apparatus and is popular and practical without being superficial, should provide themselves either with Gerlach, or with the more recent and more extensive but unfinished Bibelwerk of Lange. The latter, we learn, is likewise in process of translation in Scotland.

P. S.

THE NEW AMERICAN CYCLOPEDIA: A popular Dictionary of General Knowledge. Edited by George Ripley and Charles Dana. New York: D. Appleton & Co., 346 and 348 Broadway. London: 16 Little Britain. 1859.

We believe this mammoth work is to be completed in XVI volumes. Thus, the present VIIIth volume, brings us half way. This volume, like its predecessors, gives us nearly 800 large closely printed pages, with over 1600 subjects treated. Former volumes contained over 2000. At an average of 2000 in each volume, the whole work, when complete, will give us about 32,000 subjects. What a library!

It is very properly called the New Cyclopedia; for it is not a mere compilation from old works of the kind. Whilst it makes use of the old, as it must to be worthy of respect, it does not transfer portions of their contents in a wholesale and

undigested way. All its articles seem to be original, reproduced, incorporating the latest results of advancing Knowledge and Science. Besides, the learned and industrious authors have embodied numerous subjects not treated in the older Encyclopedias. This makes the work especially valuable to students, and the general reader. It is just this kind of information, developed in the late speedy progress of science, which it is most difficult for each one to gather for himself.

While this work deserves the title *New*, it no less properly takes to itself the name *AMERICAN Cyclopaedia*. By American compilers, the articles mostly furnished by American scholars, published by an American house, it reflects honor on American scholarship and enterprise. Besides it is peculiarly rich and full in the treatment of all American subjects; while it enables us to see foreign subjects treated in the light and view of American scholars. The mechanical execution is worthy of the contents.

H. H.